

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned to Monday, June 8, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 9, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 16, 1942.

Business to be considered: H. R. 7002, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 9, for consideration of war housing, room 1304, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7105, to provide for the suspension during the war of operating differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1718. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the third quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period beginning January 1, 1942, and ending March 31, 1942; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1719. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue it in force during the existing war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7115. A bill to promote the war effort by facilitating the planting of the full allotted acreage of cotton as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture as the Nation's war goal; with amendment (Rept.

No. 2212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6401. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the incorporation of American War Mothers," as amended, and matters relating thereto; with amendment (Rept. No. 2213). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARTER:

H. R. 7193. A bill to incorporate the Army Air Corps Mothers' Organization of America, Second World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7194. A bill to provide for the award of a special bronze medal to the heroic defenders of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7195. A bill to establish additional commissioned warrant and warrant grades in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 7196. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 7197. A bill to provide that retired Regular Army officers called to active duty shall be entitled to retirement pay in accordance with the highest temporary grade attained by them; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 7198. A bill to provide for public hearings in connection with the rationing of gasoline; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. Con. Res. 69. House concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that rationing of gasoline should not be extended unless such extension is necessary in order to conserve the supply of gasoline; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 7199. A bill granting a pension to Mildred C. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 7200. A bill to correct the military record of Herbert Horrell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3023. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of the Greenport Mission, Greenport, N. Y., in advocacy of the enactment of the Shepard bill, S. 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors in or near military or naval camps and bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3024. Also, petition of "What-so-Ever" Club of the Baptist Church of Port Jefferson, L. I., in advocacy of Senate bill 860, to prohibit sale of alcoholic beverages on or near Army camps and naval bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3025. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of F. D. Whitaker, of Topeka, Kans., and 25 others, appealing for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors, and for the passage of Senate bill 860 and House bills 3371 and 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3026. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of Besie T. Kench and other citizens of Shannon City, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 and any legislation which will provide the best possible protection for our men in the armed services against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3027. By Mr. MCGREGOR: Petition of Frank L. Elliott and other residents of Newark, Ohio, protesting against gas rationing for the Middle West; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3028. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition, signed by Mrs. Elsie M. Robinson, of Petersburg, Mich., and 48 other residents of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3029. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the national secretary, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

3030. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Townsend State convention resolution committee, Townsend Clubs of Wisconsin in convention at Marshfield, Wis., on May 23 and 24, expressing appreciation to all Wisconsin Congressmen for their cooperation in signing discharge petition No. 7, to bring House bill 1036 to the floor of the House; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3031. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Coach, Car Carriage & Automobile Painters Union, No. 1073, San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1942

The Reverend Joseph Hillman Holister, pastor of the Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, God of our fathers and our Nation's God, we look to Thee at the outset of another day, that we may prepare ourselves by looking beyond ourselves and seeing a whole in order that we may better see each part. We see a different world when we think of it as a world that belongs to Thee and when we see in it and at work a hand that is greater than ours. We see the responsibilities of office differently when we think of the servants of the people as the servants of our God. We dare to be ourselves just so long as we keep ourselves sensitive to Thy will and know that what we do we do with Thee, God, with us.

We ask Thy blessing this morning upon our world. We pray for the triumph of the right and the just and the true. We pray for our country, that, under strain, we may find our strength and again rise to the height of the stature of our fathers.

We pray for the President of the United States and for those at every

post of responsibility throughout our land, and we pray for our whole people, for their steadfastness and for their unquenchable loyalty to the best in the heart of America.

This we ask in the name of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 4, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DEATH OF BRIAN BELL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of my colleagues to the death of a distinguished South Carolinian who for years has lived in Washington. I refer to Mr. Brian Bell, the late head of the Associated Press Bureau. I know that the people of South Carolina will be distressed to learn of his death. I wished to call the attention of the Senate to it at this time. He had many friends in the Senate, and was beloved and respected.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 1, 1942:

S. 2305. An act to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances.

On June 3, 1942:

S. 2508. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2459) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Austin	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Herring	Rosier
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Barkley	Holman	Schwartz
Bone	Hughes	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bridges	Kilgore	Smith
Brooks	La Follette	Spencer
Bulow	Langer	Stewart
Burton	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Eyrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wagner
Doxey	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
George	Norris	White
Gillette	Nye	Wiley
Glass	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 4th instant,

The following message from the House of Representatives was received by the Secretary of the Senate during adjournment:

That the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 144) designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and

joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 221. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Beacon Oyster Co., the Point Wharf Oyster Co., and B. J. Rooks & Son;

S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of L. H. Goodman;

S. 1563. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard;

S. 1648. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg.;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, and others;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew;

S. 1820. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson;

S. 2037. An act for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap;

S. 2048. An act for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker;

S. 2069. An act for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc.;

S. 2103. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges;

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher;

S. 2250. An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes;

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Charles Brauch;

S. 2278. An act for the relief of Bob Sampley;

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston;

S. 2452. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

S. 2453. An act to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming;

S. 2470. An act for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy;

S. 2490. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law 166, 77th Cong.);

H. R. 4845. An act to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$30 to \$40 per month, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution for the relief of W. K. Richardson;

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect to meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat-food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Gov-

ernment of Bulgaria and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; and

H. J. Res. 321. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Rumania and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

COMMITTEE REPORT FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 4th instant,

On June 5, 1942, Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1443) thereon.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Under authority of the order of the 4th instant,

On June 4, 1942, during adjournment of the Senate, Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 32, after line 22, to insert the following:

"Section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved May 10, 1916, as amended, shall not apply from July 1 to September 15, 1942, to teachers of the public schools of the District of Columbia when employed by any of the executive departments or independent establishments of the United States Government."

On page 36, after line 24, to insert the following:

"The disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the superintendent of recreation upon requisitions previously approved by the auditor of the District of Columbia and upon such security as the Commissioners may require of said superintendent sums of money not exceeding \$500 at one time to be used for the expense of conducting its activities under the trust fund created by the act of April 29, 1942, all such expenditures to be accounted for to the accounting officers of the District of Columbia within 1 month on itemized vouchers properly approved."

On page 71, line 21, to strike out "\$208,460" and insert "\$209,660."

On page 71, line 21, after the figure, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That the employee of the Department of Vehicles and Traffic who is charged with the immediate responsibility for, and exercises supervision over, the issuance of tags and certificates of title and the registration of motor vehicles and trailers shall hereafter be known as the registrar of titles and tags,

and so long as the present incumbent of the position for which a designation is hereby provided continues to hold such position it shall be classified in grade 10 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

Mr. O'MAHONEY also, during adjournment of the Senate, submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7041, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1943, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT AND NAVAL SERVICE (S. Doc. No. 209)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1942, for the Navy Department and the naval service, amounting to \$75,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. Doc. No. 210)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1943, involving a net increase of \$270,869, in the form of amendments to the Budget, for the fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF DEFENSE WORKERS

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period beginning January 1, 1942, and ending March 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture (7), the Civil Service Commission (3), Railroad Retirement Board, and Interstate Commerce Commission, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by the annual meeting of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, at Philadelphia, Pa., relative to a congressional peace-aims commission, the creation of a United States com-

mission on international economic policy, economic discrimination against women, preservation of the rights of labor, labor in Government industries, and sundry other subjects; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WAGNER:

The petition of sundry citizens, members of the Darien and Alexander (N. Y.) Methodist churches, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Wichita and Genda Springs, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PRICES FOR AND RATIONING OF SUGAR—RESOLUTION OF LOUISIANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. OVERTON. I present, and ask to have printed, under the rule, and appropriately referred, a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of Louisiana with reference to sugar prices and sugar rationing.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

Senate concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to place a parity on sugar that will enable the sugarcane growers to realize a reasonable profit on their labor and investment and to liberalize the allotment of sugar under the rationing

Whereas the United States and its territorial possessions produces much more sugar than we normally consume; and

Whereas, due to rationing, the consumption of sugar has decreased to such an astonishing extent that the accumulated surplus will surely tend to decrease the price of the product; and

Whereas the Federal Government has established a minimum wage scale for labor on sugarcane farms which is much higher than that which is paid for labor employed for the production of other farm commodities; and

Whereas farm implements, fertilizers, etc., have increased in price while the price of sugar remains the same with a tendency to go lower with the results that a large established and essential war industry is not earning a reasonable return on its investment; and

Whereas the parity on sugar is unjust and unreasonable since the price was approximately the same in 1909 to 1914 as it is now while the prices of nonfarm products have increased from 100 to 1,000 percent; and

Whereas there exists no shortage of sugar now and the incoming crop is considered the largest sugarcane and sugar-beet crop ever grown in this country alleviating the fears of those who may worry over a sugar shortage: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States now in session that the authorities vested with the rationing of sugar be requested to liberalize

the allotment of sugar under the ration regulations and to raise the parity of sugar; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Louisiana and Florida senatorial and congressional delegations, and the press.

MARC M. MOUTON,
Lieutenant Governor and President
of the Senate.

B. NORMAN BAUER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ELLENDER presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Louisiana, identical with the foregoing, memorializing the Congress of the United States to place a parity on sugar that will enable the sugarcane growers to realize a reasonable profit on their labor and investment and to liberalize the allotment of sugar under the rationing.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I present a petition from the State of Texas for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, in connection with the petition, a letter from Mrs. Claude DeVan Watts, of Austin, Tex. The petition is signed by 2,108 petitioners, and asks that the Congress give immediate attention and favorable consideration to Senate bill 860.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition will lie on the table. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN
TEMPERANCE UNION,
Austin, Tex., May 20, 1942.

Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in executive committee session, May 16, 1942, Austin, Tex., commends your consistent and determined stand for Senate 860.

We send you hearty greetings and pledge you our earnest efforts for the passage of the bill.

We are mailing the first instalment of 2,108 names of the Lone Star petition of 10,000 signatures we are endeavoring to send you within a few weeks.

The petition will be mailed to you by parcel post.

Many of the unions may send you the petitions direct. I suggest you place them with the roll I am sending you.

Enclosed is a picture of the executive committee and the petition.

The membership of the committee is 50 women from over the State.

With sincere wishes for your success.

Your friend,

Mrs. CLAUDE DEVAN WATTS.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by 84 citizens of Tampa, Fla., calling on the Congress to enact Senate bill 860, for the protection of the boys in the training camps of America.

I also present for appropriate reference a petition forwarded to me by Mrs. Laura E. Holmes, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of my home city of Orlando, Fla., containing 826

names, calling on the Congress to enact Senate bill 860.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions presented by the Senator from Florida will lie on the table.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by divers citizens of Kentucky with reference to Senate bill 860. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Congressmen and Senators representing
the State of Kentucky:

We the undersigned citizens and legal voters appeal to you to give your influence and votes to secure the protection of our soldiers from the evil effects of beer and strong drinks; and in particular we urge the speedy enactment of the bill S. 860. We assure you that only in this way can you expect the support of citizens who have the welfare of our country and the success of our national defense at heart.

Mrs. O. H. CALLIS.

Rev. O. H. CALLIS.

HARLAN MAYS.

EVERETT ESTES.

(And sundry other citizens of the
State of Kentucky.)

SHIPMENT OF COAL TO NEW ENGLAND, NEW YORK, AND NEW JERSEY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I understand that the Office of Price Administration is working out a plan to pay subventions or rebates on Appalachian coal to New England, New York, and certain portions of New Jersey to compensate the buyers of southern coal for such differences in transportation costs as may be shown to be in effect today as compared with the cost of transportation in December 1941.

Mr. President, the differentials on coal produced in the southern and northern fields have been in effect for the past 15 years. It is now proposed that these be changed by administrative edict. There is no assurance that once these differentials have been wiped out they would ever be restored, and it is a matter of great importance to coal operators in Pennsylvania.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Walter A. Jones, secretary-treasurer of the Bituminous Coal Producers Board for district No. 1, Altoona, Pa., together with copies of letters written by him on May 7 and 11, to Hon. Leon Henderson, Price Administrator.

It is my intention to have a thorough investigation of this proposed plan, and I ask that these letters be referred to the Senate Committee on Mines and Mining.

I have just returned from a week-end trip. People talk about practically nothing but the war and the way it affects their lives. Comments on rationing of gas, sugar, and the cost of living are on every tongue.

I find that people generally are not convinced that the rationing of gas is necessary. Especially in areas where storage facilities are lacking, there is protest against the waste occasioned.

In regard to the rationing of sugar, there is difficulty in women obtaining necessary amounts for their usual summer canning, and this brings about other problems which might be avoided by a more liberal allowance of sugar for this specific purpose. If women used their glass jars and other canning equipment already on hand they could readily save additional calls on tin required for commercial canning.

Restrictions in one field, where attempts are made to solve shortages, lead to problems in other fields, possibly as grave and difficult. In all of this procedure, necessary as it may be, we should look before we leap.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BITUMINOUS COAL PRODUCERS

BOARD FOR DISTRICT NO. 1,
Altoona, Pa., May 13, 1942.

The Honorable JAMES JOHN DAVIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You have my telegram of May 12 protesting the proposed plan of subvention to consumers of bituminous coal in New England and portions of New York and New Jersey who receive coal all-rail from southern mines.

In order to acquaint you with the action already taken in the matter by this district board, copies of two letters to Mr. Leon Henderson, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, dated May 7 and May 11, 1942, respectively, are attached. This correspondence shows conclusively the inequality to the northern coal producers of the plan and sets forth our reasons for vigorously opposing the proposed subvention.

In the interest of fair treatment to the northern coal producers, you are urged to do all possible to prevent the plan from being established.

Very truly yours,

WALTER A. JONES,
Secretary-Treasurer.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 7, 1942.

HON. LEON HENDERSON, Administrator,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: As requested by you yesterday, I am writing you this statement of my views of the proposed plan, as far as I understand it, that is now being worked out by your office to pay subventions or rebates on southern coal to New England, New York, and certain portions of New Jersey to compensate the buyers of southern coal for such differences in transportation costs that may be shown to be in effect today as compared with the cost of transportation in December 1941. In other words, the costs of waterborne coal from the southern West Virginia mines here which went by rail increased as a result of submarine warfare along that coast. In order to avoid the possibility of submarine sinking as much as possible a great deal of this vessel water-borne coal has been diverted from going outside the Virginia Capes and instead is proceeding up Chesapeake Bay and thence via the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal to the Delaware River and from thence down the river to outside the Delaware Capes and then from Lewes, Del., to New York where the coal is delivered by vessel or is transported beyond New York through Hell Gate to destinations on Long Island Sound and beyond to Boston and other points east thereof. This has reduced the

carriage capacity of the fleet of vessels by about one-third and, of course, has increased the cost of carriage by reason of insurance rates, etc.

To supplement the above movement of coal, and in order to make up for the deficiency a considerably greater quantity of coal is now being moved all-rail from the southern West Virginia mines through Potomac Yard at Washington and Hagerstown, Md., to the Hudson River gateways for New England and to the New York dumping piers for delivery inside New York Harbor and Long Island Sound points.

These differentials have been in existence for many years and coal has moved thereon for the past 15 years. As I understand the proposition, it is now proposed that subventions will be paid by Government to a consumer in New England, New York, or New Jersey that takes in southern coal to reimburse him for the increase in transportation costs occasioned by this change in routing to the level that it cost him for moving the coal to Hampton Roads by rail and thence by vessel to New York last December. In other words, it is proposed that the differential in freight rates between northern and southern coal will be changed by the Government paying a rebate to receivers of southern coal based upon their rail and water combination last December thereby wiping out the established rate fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission some 15 years ago. This appears to be a back-handed way of reducing southern coal rail rates and contrary to lawfully established rates.

These all-rail rates on bituminous coal from the Pocahontas fields into eastern trunk lines and New England territory in effect at the present time were originally prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in Docket No. 15006, 101 I. C. C.

The Commission prescribed these rates in an effort to meet an emergency in this territory brought about by the prolonged anthracite strike of 1925-26. The rates were originally published as a temporary measure, but upon subsequent review by the Commission were ordered in on a permanent basis effective June 5, 1928.

In that proceeding the Commission likewise gave consideration to the all-rail rates from the northern fields and the rates to New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Hampton Roads for tidewater.

The final decision of the Commission in its supplemental order No. 29 to Docket No. 15006 prescribed differentials from the New River-Pocahontas field into eastern trunk line and New England territories, the differentials ranging from \$1.25 to \$2.10 per gross ton over the rates from the Clearfield District. When prescribing these differentials, as well as passing upon the rate structure as a whole, the Commission's decision refers to the boat charges in effect in 1926 from Hampton Roads to New York harbor points as ranging from 60 cents to 75 cents per ton and from Hampton Roads to Boston, 75 cents per ton. In other words, the level of all-rail rates prescribed at that time take into consideration the very low boat rates then existing. (See 140 I. C. C. 23 for boat rates.)

Many of the all-rail rates from the Clearfield District to eastern New England are issued to meet water competition, including such points as Boston, Milton, Quincy, and Salem, Mass., and Portland, Maine, as well as Portsmouth, N. H.

The all-rail distances from the Clearfield District are very substantially shorter to New York and New England points than the all-rail distances from the corresponding fields in the South. As an illustration, the distance to Jersey City, where some of the New York piers are located, from the New River-Pocahontas field is approximately 240 miles greater, and to Boston approximately 215 miles greater than the distance to the

Clearfield district. To interior New England points the spread is even greater.

Under the joint returns from the southern fields referred to above there has been a varying amount of coal moving each year, but during the period from October 15, 1925, until May 31, 1926, there moved via the Pennsylvania Railroad 21,049 cars, or in excess of 1,200,000 tons. This tonnage is reported in Docket No. 18034, 150 I. C. C. 534. Moreover, the report of the Commission indicates a very substantial movement via the routes other than the Pennsylvania Railroad, and it will thus be seen that there was a very large movement under the prescribed rates and since that time the movement has been on a smaller basis ranging from 100,000 to 200,000 tons annually up until the recent emergency. There is now a very large movement of coal under these rates via all-rail routes into New England and a substantial movement has begun to New York tidewater piers to which the rates became effective May 1. It is estimated that at the present time the all-rail movement into New England is from 250 to 300 cars daily. In addition, there is a substantial tonnage moving into eastern trunk-line territory.

Any proposal to subsidize the movement of all-rail bituminous coal from the southern field to New York and New England on the basis of rail and water transportation charges via Hampton Roads in effect in December 1941 would, in many instances, result in the elimination of the differentials prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission under which very large tonnages of coal are now moved. Moreover, it would mean that there would be no incentive for the consumers in New England or New York to examine the possibility of the northern fields in an effort to obtain coal from sources which would involve a minimum of all-rail transportation.

There would likewise be no incentive for the consumers or the southern operator to use the water route via Hampton Roads to the extent available, and therefore the rail carriers would be called upon to perform a greater rail service than at the present time, and by reason of the added haul severe strain would be placed upon the coal-car supply. It should not be forgotten that when coal from the southern fields moves into New England and New York all-rail that the added loaded distances over the haul from the northern fields is in excess of 200 miles, and as the empty cars must be returned to the mines, there is an excess car movement of over 400 miles. This places an added burden upon the available motive power of the carriers.

It is just possible as a result of the subventions that transportation charges from southern fields to the consumers in New England via the all-rail route might be less than the actual all-rail charges from the nearby Clearfield district. Using as an illustration the rate from the Clearfield district to Boston of \$4.39 per gross ton, compared with the all-rail rate from the Pocahontas field of \$5.75 per gross ton, the combination water and rail rate via Hampton Roads from Pocahontas would be \$2.69 to Norfolk, plus 5 cents dumping, \$1 boat rate, and 35 cents unloading charge, or a total charge of \$4.09. Assuming that this combination would be used as a basis for subventions, this would mean that the consumer would pay \$4.09 for the all-rail movement from the southern fields to Boston, as compared with the all-rail rate from Clearfield of \$4.39, or, in reality, 3 cents per ton less for the added distance of more than 200 miles. Moreover it would be \$1.66 lower than the prescribed all-rail rates from the Pocahontas district to Boston.

The anthracite producers who are located close to New England are urging consumers to use anthracite to meet the possible shortage of fuel, and because of their geographical location and to the extent that they are successful the desire for maximum movement of

coal-carrying equipment and motive power is progressed in that the distance to New England from the anthracite fields is substantially less than from the northern and southern bituminous fields. Under the circumstances, it is my view that if there is to be any freezing of prices or subventions, the basis should be that of the published all-rail rates from the southern fields in effect during the month of December 1941, which were, as has been pointed out, prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission after exhaustive hearings involving not only the level of the rates but the relationship of the competing fields and which, in times of emergency such as the present times, have moved large tonnages of coal from the South.

Moreover, it is important that this basis be observed in the interest of efficient transportation because any subvention which will permit or encourage the movement of coal from the southern fields all-rail to the same consumers who have been receiving it via tidewater at exactly the same cost will have the effect of having these consumers ignore the water routes because of present hazards, and the nearby anthracite and bituminous districts as a source of supply, thereby placing on the railroads the burden of added transportation which, under existing conditions, may jeopardize coal-car supply in the whole country.

It is also proposed that where coal is shipped by water that the difference between the rates today and the rates in effect last December shall be rebated by the Government.

This can be a very serious matter and may result in an attempt to freeze markets or utilized to expand markets at the expense of northern mines. I was assured by the representative of the Government with whom I talked that this was not the intention. There is no valid objection to the fosterage by Government of the movement of coal by water. This should be accomplished by absorbing increased costs of water transportation to the critical area, which if it develop would be eastern New England. Subventions or rebates should be paid for water-borne deliveries east of New London, Conn. In this way a proper movement will be brought about. There is no question of coal supply west of such line. If southern coal is to receive rebates wherever it goes or ever has gone it will result in rank injustices and in many instances promote unsound movement of coal and wastage of transportation facilities. If a consumer can show that at some time he received coal at Springfield, Mass., and is rebated to equalize a combination of distress boat rates and mine prices the same result will be brought about as is illustrated in the case of Boston. Coal may be delivered at a lower rate for the longer haul. This is surely illogical under the present circumstances.

Government should not pay subventions against a rail rate that it fixed and found to be just and reasonable and thereby change a differential that has been in existence for years without at least giving the parties who may be affected a proper hearing.

Further, there is no such thing as a fixed rate on boats that carry coal from Hampton Roads to eastern coastal points. The boats are privately owned and privately contracted and have been subject to private negotiation and barter. My understanding is that a fair rate for December is to be set up by some agency.

The proposed subventions, as I understand it, are being confined at the present time to the New England, New York, and New Jersey area. There are many analogous situations in the country at the present time at such places as Baltimore, Buffalo, and many others are being considered by compelling the use of alternate routes at a higher cost of delivery.

If this plan is promiscuously applied it will result in great dispersion of railway

equipment also, resulting in slowing up movement of coal generally.

As a matter of overall policy rebates should not be granted on bituminous coal in any case to absorb costs out of Government prescribed rates unless all shippers are treated exactly alike under such policy of rebating.

On behalf of coal operators of Pennsylvania whom I represent, it is respectfully requested that our views in this matter be considered, and that opportunity be granted to us to criticize such rebates, and rules and regulation before these are made effective.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES O'NEILL,
President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 11, 1942.
HON. LEON HENDERSON, Administrator,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: Supplementing my letter to you dated May 7 concerning proposed plan to pay rebates on coal from southern mines shipped all-rail all distances, I wish to add the following:

1. So far as all-rail coal which moves from the northern mines, it is originated on the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Baltimore & Ohio and the New York Central, and these mines have always been the primary shippers of all-rail coal to the so-called subvention area. It may be said that the greater tonnage of coal going to New England for the past several years has been tidewater and ex-tidewater deliveries. However, the much greater proportion of the coal moving all-rail via Hudson River gateways has been from northern mines (not southern mines) and consideration should be given to this fact.

2. It is wholly illogical to haul coal hundreds of miles farther via an all-rail route than in the end means an extra turn-around car mileage of double the excess distance and pay a subsidy or grant a rebate to foster such a wasteful movement.

3. As much tonnage as possible should be moved to New England by water, because all of the coal necessary for New England cannot be moved all-rail and as much coal as is possible should be encouraged to move to eastern New England by water where the all-rail haul increases to great lengths from all fields, northern and southern bituminous as well as anthracite. A line drawn east of New London, Conn., and thence northeast of Worcester, Mass., would approximate the critical area.

4. It is agreed that to the extent it is necessary to provide coal by water for eastern New England, coal for the by-product coking plants in New York Harbor and possibly New Haven, Conn., may have to move all-rail from southern mines.

5. The whole proposition looks like an arbitrary one based upon some theoretical boat price, that is presently unknown, to protect a particular movement of coal whether substitute or alternate coals are now being used or whether satisfactory price relationships upon such coals have been established by consumers.

6. So far as the plan has been disclosed, the payment of subventions to move southern coal all-rail to points where it may be unnecessary to move it is all wrong, for instance, the proposition of delivering southern coal all-rail inland in New England at a lower rate than the all-rail rate from northern mines to such destinations (for example, Worcester, Mass.), violates every rule of common sense.

7. It would be just as unreasonable to pay a subvention to consumers all over the United States who have to use railroads and rail rates for the carriage of their goods in place of truck transportation if such rates are higher. Dr. Parmelee, famous railroad economist, estimates that there will be a diver-

sion of 10 percent of the truck tonnage to railroads within a year. I think the situation presented in this case would be exactly the same, that is, to pay a subvention on southern all-rail coal to all northeastern destinations.

8. The analogous situations that have been called to your attention and those that may be compelled by shortage of marine transportation may amount to millions of tons and a great deal of money.

9. Such a scheme could only result in the protection of the maximum prices to the producing beneficiaries, regardless of the real situation marketwise. Certainly this cannot be the intention of the Office of Price Administration. A scheme of subventions or rebates that would foster a transportation shortage for the movement of coal would cause much damage to the country and should not be put into effect.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES O'NEILL, President.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE—LETTERS, RESOLUTIONS, AND TELEGRAM FROM KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I again rise to call the attention of the Senate to some things that should be carefully considered before gasoline rationing is applied to those sections of the Nation where gasoline is a surplus commodity and where rationing will mean still larger surpluses, unless the refineries are closed down. What the closing down of the refineries will do to other necessary war operations is something to think about.

The question, What can the refineries do with their surplus gasoline? is raised by the Wichita, Kans., Chamber of Commerce, in resolutions just received by me. The resolutions go into the entire matter very thoroughly, and I believe should be read and given careful consideration by every Senator. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions and the accompanying letter from W. L. Ainsworth, chairman of the oil and gas committee of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce, printed in the RECORD at this point; also a letter from Mr. Allen W. Hinkel, of Wichita, on the same subject, together with a telegram from the Argo Oil Corporation of Wichita on the same subject, signed by Lee Scott.

There being no objection, the letters, resolutions, and telegram were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WICHITA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Wichita, Kans., June 3, 1942.

To Senators and Congressmen of Oil Producing States.

GENTLEMEN: The Wichita Chamber of Commerce has been very much interested in your efforts to prevent the useless rationing of gasoline in the Middle West. I am certain that everyone who understands the true conditions in this part of the country thinks as we do in this matter.

At its regular meeting on June 2 the board of directors of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution opposing gasoline rationing in the Middle West. I am enclosing a copy of this resolution.

If there is anything the Wichita Chamber of Commerce can do to help you in your effort to prevent gasoline rationing in this section of the country, please let us know as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,
W. L. AINSWORTH,
Chairman, Oil and Gas Committee.

RESOLUTION OF OIL AND GAS COMMITTEE OF THE WICHITA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, WICHITA, KANS.

Be it resolved by the oil and gas committee of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce:

The Office of Price Administration has under consideration the matter of rationing the consumption of gasoline in the Middle West. We urge that before any such action is taken, thorough consideration be given to the following facts:

1. Fuel oil as well as aviation gasoline, butadiene, and toluene, are byproducts in the manufacture of gasoline.

The amount of gasoline produced by refining a barrel of crude oil may be varied to a considerable extent. The refineries in this part of the country have already cut down the production of gasoline from a barrel of crude oil to about 40 percent of the total volume of products refined. This is about as low a percentage of gasoline as it is possible for our refineries to produce.

This gasoline must be disposed of in some manner. The consumption of gasoline in this area is certain to be greatly lowered if the board issues a rationing order. The rationing of gasoline along the Atlantic seaboard and the considerably reduced consumption of gasoline owing to tire rationing has already greatly curtailed the market for gasoline produced by Middle West refineries. The result is that these refineries have already very nearly exhausted their storage space. This condition exists as to the refineries located here at Wichita. If there is a further curtailment of consumption the refineries will be unable to continue to refine oil because of the impossibility of disposing of the gasoline necessarily produced as a byproduct in the production of fuel oil. Our local refineries are already shipping a very large percentage of their fuel oil to the Atlantic seaboard. A further curtailment of consumption of gasoline in the local market of these refineries will make it necessary for them to shut down over long periods of time until the gasoline in their storage tanks is disposed of. While they are shut down they obviously cannot produce fuel oil, aviation gasoline, butadiene, and toluene. It is hardly necessary to point out the necessity to our armed forces of such products as aviation gasoline and toluene or the importance of butadiene in the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

The situation above outlined will result in the operation of the refineries at a loss, but it is not the question of profit or loss which is important, the important question is, What can the refineries do with their surplus gasoline?

2. When the rationing of gasoline results in the shutting down of refineries as it will do, this means in turn a decreased production of oil. Storage facilities for crude oil are not sufficient to permit the continued operation of wells which are unable to dispose of their oil.

Oil is one of the most necessary products for the successful prosecution of the war. Unless great care is exercised in the regulation of all matters affecting its production, the United States may find itself confronted with an oil shortage at the most critical time in the further progress of the war.

3. The rationing of natural gas under War Production Board order L-31, which prevents gas companies in this area from taking on an additional heating load greatly increases the local demand for fuel oil. This fuel oil cannot be produced without the producing of a large quantity of gasoline at the same time.

4. Fuel oil is essential to many industries in this part of the country which are in their turn essential to our war effort. Nearly all railroad engines west of Kansas City burn fuel oil. To deprive the railroads of this fuel oil would greatly complicate the trans-

portation problem which is already a critical one. The only other possible fuels for industries and railroads are coal and coke, but to use such materials would not only greatly aggravate the already serious transportation problem, but require a complete rebuilding of their fuel-consuming equipment by many industrial plants and railroads. The necessary materials for such rebuilding are not available under present restrictions. It is also true that such rebuilding of fuel-consuming equipment would involve an enormous loss of time in industries essential to the prosecution of the war.

5. Throughout the western part of the United States there is almost a total lack of mass-transportation facilities of any character. In the past the private automobile has made up for this lack of such facilities. If the private automobile is taken off of the roads, the problems of the railroads and bus lines will be greatly augmented. There are practically no streetcar lines in the West and in cities large enough to have such lines they are entirely insufficient to meet the local problems of transportation of passengers unless augmented by private automobiles. Many good-sized cities have no streetcar lines at all and it is obviously impossible to construct them now in time to take care of the transportation problem. In Wichita there are 4 airplane plants located several miles from the city which have at this time about 25,000 employees and will soon double that number. These employees are now transported in private automobiles. Much thought has been given to the problem of transporting them in some other way but no feasible method has been found.

6. It is said that the object of gasoline rationing in the Middle West would be to conserve rubber. The only rubber it would conserve would be the rubber now on the cars. Obviously this rubber will wear out in time and when that time comes the problem will have to be met as best it can. But time is an important factor in our present war effort and we believe it is far more important that our refineries should continue to produce the necessary fuel oil to keep necessary war industries in operation and furnish the Army and the Navy with the gasoline and fuel oil which they need, than it is to consider what we are going to do when all the tires are worn out. A very large number of vehicles are equipped with rubber which will last them for 2 years.

The exhaustion of the rubber on vehicles now in use will come gradually, and as that time approaches such action can be taken as the necessities of the case may demand. But of what use is it to preserve the rubber on a private vehicle if the consumption of gasoline by the vehicle is curtailed to a point where the usefulness of the vehicle is destroyed.

If it is necessary to place further restrictions upon the use of motor vehicles, we believe that a national speed limit of 40 miles per hour would go a long way toward preserving the rubber on motor vehicles now in use, and while it would to some extent curtail the consumption of gasoline we do not think that the results would be so disastrous as those which would be produced by the rationing of gasoline.

7. The extent of the damage which might be unwittingly done to the war effort by the crippling of Midwestern refineries and the consequent curtailment of Middle West production is apparent when we consider the extent of oil production in that area. The States of Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, Illinois, and Indiana produce about 2,600,000 barrels of oil per day. The total production of oil in the United States is about 3,600,000 barrels per day.

8. The curtailment of the sale of gasoline will seriously affect an important source of revenue to the State and National Govern-

ments. The total State revenue of Kansas is \$35,000,000 per year. Of this the gasoline tax furnishes \$11,000,000.

9. We endorse the statement issued by Frank Phillips, general chairman of the petroleum industry for district No. 2, appointed by Petroleum Coordinator for War, Harold L. Ickes, which was issued from Chicago on May 24, 1942, and which discusses this matter.

10. What has been said above is based solely upon the consideration of what is best for the entire country in the prosecution of its war effort. We have not taken into consideration the financial effect upon oil companies or producers. However, the disturbance of our already burdened economy, which will be caused by the financial crippling of our refineries by the curtailment of the consumption of gasoline in the Middle West, is a factor which will still further retard the production of essential materials for the prosecution of the war. We appreciate the fact that the successful prosecution of the war comes first and that every inconvenience or damage to business and to the public must receive secondary consideration, but we firmly believe that considering the effect upon our war effort the rationing of gasoline in the Middle West would prove disastrous.

We urge that the most serious consideration be given to the matters suggested herein by the Office of Price Administration and all other agencies of the Government which are in any way concerned with this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Office of Price Administration, the Army and Navy, War Production Board, Joseph B. Eastman of the Office of Defense Transportation, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Coordinator for War, the Members of Congress from Kansas, and such other officials and agencies as the executive officials of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce may deem advisable.

THE ALLEN W. HINKEL Co.,
Wichita, Kans., June 1, 1942.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator From Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Nation-wide gasoline rationing is apparently on the program for the near future, although there is certainly no shortage of gasoline imminent in the Middle West.

The argument appears to be that this is necessary to stop the use of tires. Let us examine the other side of the picture. For 10 years or more many Kansans interested in oil production, of which I happen to be one, have been unable to market their potential stocks of crude oil because of an oversupply which made necessary the proration laws. There is still an adequate supply.

The Nation-wide rationing of gasoline will seriously injure the oil companies, will destroy the small filling-station operator entirely, and will have a very destructive effect upon all other lines of business. If the farmer cannot get to town, the small merchants will suffer, and even in a city like Wichita, which is largely dependent on its trade territory, will be badly hurt.

I submit that Americans everywhere will stop at no sacrifice necessary to the winning of this war, but I also submit that unnecessary regulations injurious to the livelihood of ordinary folks will do more harm than good, and I raise my voice in protest against this action.

It seems to me that Mr. Leon Henderson, of the Office of Price Administration, has been granted too much power for any one man to wield, and I think it is time that the Members of Congress give some thought to matters themselves.

I shall appreciate your reaction of these ideas at your early convenience.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN W. HINKEL.

WICHITA, KANS.,
June 3, 1942.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Gasoline rationing in Kansas and other oil-producing States would greatly retard oil development. We have plenty of gasoline in this section of country. Extremely foolish to penalize this part of country because eastern seaboard is short. Please pass this information to Kansas delegation.

ARGO OIL CORPORATION,
LEE SCOTT.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 538. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Raymond P. Finnegan; with amendments (Rept. No. 1444); and

H. R. 3337. A bill to provide for the issuance of a duplicate adjusted-service certificate to Andrew J. Bissinger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1445).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2558. A bill to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1446).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6899. A bill to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916; with amendments (Rept. No. 1447).

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 2412. A bill to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1448).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 6355. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes,'" approved June 28, 1940; with amendments (Rept. No. 1451).

H. R. 7036. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 1449);

H. R. 7159. A bill authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1450); and

S. Res. 259. Resolution authorizing the inspection of United States navy yards, air stations, and other naval activities; without amendment; and, under the rule referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7182. A bill making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1452); and

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1453).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

On June 2, 1942:

S. 1637. An act to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.:

S. 2088. An act to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations;

S. 2097. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the board of trustees, School District No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., a parcel of land situated in the city of Charleston, S. C.;

S. 2229. An act to provide for the retirement, rank, and pay of heads of staff departments of the Marine Corps;

S. 2382. An act to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes; and

S. 2446. An act to prescribe certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training, and for other purposes.

On June 5, 1942:

S. 2250. An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

On June 6, 1942:

S. 221. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Beacon Oyster Co., the Point Wharf Oyster Co., and B. J. Rooks & Son;

S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of L. H. Goodman;

S. 1563. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard;

S. 1648. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg.;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller et al.;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew;

S. 1820. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson;

S. 2037. An act for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap;

S. 2048. An act for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker;

S. 2069. An act for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc.;

S. 2103. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools

and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges;

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher;

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Charles Brauch;

S. 2278. An act for the relief of Bob Sampley;

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston;

S. 2452. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

S. 2453. An act to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming;

S. 2470. An act for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy;

S. 2490. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law 166, 77th Cong.); and

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution for the relief of W. K. Richardson.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 2579. A bill to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK):

S. 2580. A bill to provide for reimbursing States for losses in gasoline-tax revenues sustained on account of the rationing of gasoline under the authority of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2581. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROSIER:

S. 2582. A bill to make Younghill Kang eligible for naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2583. A bill to exempt from the provisions of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940 certain naturalized American citizens temporarily residing in certain foreign states in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 2584. A bill to permit appointment of White House police, in accordance with the civil-service laws, from sources outside the Metropolitan and United States Park Police forces; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

(Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL) introduced Senate bill 2585, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2586. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Presi-

dent to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue it in force during the existing war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution to create a commission for the emergency safeguarding of the Capitol and other buildings in the legislative group, and other buildings under the Architect of the Capitol; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

LOANS ON 1942 CROPS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself I introduce a bill, which I ask to have read, and with respect to which I wish to make a very brief statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be read.

The bill (S. 2585) to provide that loans on the 1942 crop of corn, wheat, rice, cotton, tobacco, and peanuts shall be made at a rate equal to the parity price, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (a) of paragraph No. 10 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended," is amended to read as follows:

"(a) To cooperators (except cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at a rate equal to the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year in the case of the 1942 crop of such commodities, and at the rate of 85 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year in the case of the crops of such commodities for the other years above specified."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there is constantly expressed anxiety about an inflationary run-away in our price situation. There may be some signs of it in industrial commodities, but so far as agriculture is concerned the situation is exactly the reverse. It has been repeatedly charged by a number of newspapers and commentators that agricultural prices constitute an inflationary threat. The facts are exactly the opposite. If other prices are going up, resulting in inflation, an additional burden is placed upon agricultural producers, because their prices are going down.

In the past 10 days the prices of grains have suffered a very great decrease. Take the case of wheat. On Saturday the price of July wheat on the Chicago exchange closed at \$1.17½ a bushel. About 2 weeks ago the price of wheat on the same market was about \$1.30 a bushel. So within that short period there has been a reduction in the price of wheat of approximately 13 cents a bushel.

There has also been a reduction in the price of rye. On Saturday the price of July rye closed at 64½ cents. Only a few days ago it was above 70 cents.

The price of cotton has gone down within the last 10 days from \$10 to \$12 a bale without any apparent reason for the reduction. There has been no change in the supply. There has been an increase, if any change at all, in consump-

tion; but notwithstanding those facts, prices have been drifting down and are continuing down. Last Saturday was one of the worst days in the matter of price reductions. The price of cotton, for instance, went down \$2.50 a bale—50 points—without any apparent reason to justify the decline.

That is in the face, Mr. President, of a fear of inflation. I am not arguing for inflation. I do not want to see it; but, according to the newspapers, we are about to appropriate a tremendous amount of money if we follow the requests made to Congress to prevent inflation. There is talk about 100,000 more employees for the O. P. A., and more than \$100,000,000 is being requested in appropriations to prevent inflation; and yet we confront the situation I have described with the farm population constituting nearly one-fourth of the population of America. Their prices, instead of going up, are going down. Deflation, rather than inflation, is in effect in agriculture.

The farmers must pay the increased prices which are being brought about in industry. The effect of that situation, to prevent which so much money is being asked for and so many employees requested, bears down upon the farmers. Instead of their receiving more income with which to meet the increased expenditures, we learn, according to the figures I have cited and according to common knowledge, that just the opposite is happening. New crops are now coming into the market. Wheat will soon be harvested. In a few months cotton will be harvested, and so will corn.

When Mr. Herbert Hoover, the Food Administrator during the first World War, was before the Committee on Banking and Currency, he warned that committee that, instead of being anxious about price ceilings, it had better look after price floors. That was the question to be uneasy about and to be considered by that committee, and protection in some way secured. Now we find that his prediction has been proven.

I desire to make a short statement about the bill, and then I shall conclude. It is an amendment to the 85-percent loan bill. It provides for increasing the rate of loans upon this year's crop only to 100 percent of parity to parity prices. The only complaint I have heard made against the farmers is that they have been seeking an income above parity. The bill does not provide for more than parity; it merely provides a floor under which cooperating farmers, instead of receiving 85 percent of loans, may receive in order to meet the increased expenses they must bear, a floor of 100 percent of parity itself.

Therefore, I hope to have the cooperation of every Senator who is interested in having decent, fair treatment accorded to the farmers. We shall try to have a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have just consulted the chairman of that committee, who sits beside me, and he assures me that at an

early date he will call a meeting of the committee to consider this bill.

Mr. McNARY. I have read the bill now before the Senate. In it there is no request for reference to a committee. It appears to be an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act. I assume that the bill will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry rather than lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7182) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 2, after line 6, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Miscellaneous expenses, Navy, 1942: For the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the classification laws, or section 5 of the act of April 6, 1914 (38 Stat. 335), \$75,000, of which amount \$65,000 shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred since January 28, 1942."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7182, making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD a letter from Estancia, N. Mex., written by George A. Sweetman, general manager of the Planters Mutual Insurance Co. The letter deals with Nation-wide rationing of gasoline. I offer this letter because of the pertinent facts and the information therein contained, in the hope that it will be read by someone having something to do with Nation-wide rationing of gasoline.

I also present for the RECORD a letter from Quemado, N. Mex., which deals with the subject of trucking. I hope that this letter also will be read by someone who is about to make orders that a truck making deliveries must carry a return

load, in order that such officials may receive some information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLANTERS MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.,
Estancia, N. Mex., June 3, 1942.

HON. CARL HATCH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It seems at this time there is much being said relative to the rationing of gasoline throughout the United States. Perhaps it is essential in some parts, more so, I assume, on account of transportation than it is on account of shortage.

However, it does not seem that it should be general in our home State, at least where our wells are hobbled to hold down overproduction, in case it is needed for an essential purpose. Of course, we all agree that war necessities are essential, but there are some businesses that should have a little preference to the average layman's business or the pleasure seeker.

For instance, I wish to speak of my own case. I have the above company and organization incorporated in our State, the same which shows to be solvent, in addition to having a large volume of business, which is still growing, to look after, and due to the fact that the same is in the rural districts and in many cases 40 or 50 miles from the railroad or bus lines, a car is the only means of transportation to reach people in order to make adjustments in case of losses, etc.

Our case has already been hampered by the rationing of rubber, but due to the fact that I have only used my car directly for the purpose within mentioned, I have enough old tires that would not really be accepted by the Government for use for as much as 25 to 50 cents apiece as second-hand tires; yet by managing and being careful, by driving at moderate speeds, I can get to and from my work and get it attended to for at least this year, provided I could have gasoline. As most of my insurance—in fact, all—is rural districts on rural crops or grain stored, an essential product to the efforts of our cause, it seems to me that our business should be considered a necessity to the extent of taking care of our business, as we operate State-wide and have quite a lot of territory to cover.

Due to the fact that I have never been able to find any place where we have a right-of-way for getting even tires, it would pretty near ruin us to now cut us off from gasoline in the center of our business, which supplies work for agents, mostly of ages above the Government's consideration for help. In fact, I have men working up around 70 that are making a living for themselves and families, and I do not really have a young man on the staff.

We pay our taxes, we own our property in the State, we expect to buy our full quota of bonds, and should we be cut off from these essentials, it would be very hard to even live, let alone buy a single bond. And, for the very few dollars of essentials necessary to keep our business running, it seems to me like it would be good business to let a business continue that would continue to buy probably \$50 worth of bonds for every \$5 invested in such things as tires, or tires and gasoline together. It might not run quite that proportion, however, but I feel sure the favor would be on the side of the Government.

Yours very truly,
PLANTERS MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.,
GEO. A. SWEETMAN, General Manager.

QUEMADO, N. MEX., June 1, 1942.
 Senator CARL HATCH,
 Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: We have been keeping in close touch with the proposed law of rationing gasoline, thinking and hoping that this would not come to pass; however, as time goes along it seems that it will become a law, and in view of our situation we wish you would cause as much protest against this measure as can possibly be at your command.

As you know, Senator HATCH, Catron County, as well as some others, doesn't have a railroad. Quemado, the largest town, doesn't even have telephone communication with the outside world. Our only means of communication is by mail, and only means of transportation is by automobile, truck, or bus.

Should this bill become a law as proposed, it would become necessary to haul all supplies to Catron County by wagon and teams from supply points reaching to over 100 miles; that is, if trucks must have some load for return trips, as there is nothing to load with, going out, except at stock shipping times.

There isn't a hospital in Catron County and only three doctors, widely separated; in emergency cases we take patients to hospitals in Albuquerque, a distance of 192 miles; other communities are even farther, and in several other States.

Most of our counties in our Western States are larger than many of the Eastern States, and, as you know, most of our people are engaged in the raising of cattle and sheep, most of them being many miles from points of supply; and should they be compelled to haul all ranch supplies and feed they need, would necessitate more time to this work alone than there is in 1 year.

Such a law, if passed, would mean many unnecessary hardships, much unnecessary sickness and many unnecessary deaths and much suffering on account of our inability of not having doctors and medicines. And we cannot think of any law being imposed on people of the United States of America which would impose the many unnecessary hardships as this one seems to us.

As to the loyalty of the people of New Mexico, our record in the present conflict speaks for itself, and we are proud of it, not only in the present war but in the first World War and others down in history.

Speaking for the majority of the Western States, should this proposed law be passed, it would mean the complete destruction of our cattle and sheep industry, our mining, lumber, coal, and oil industries, and would take thousands of men from employment, all because of having their honest means of support outlawed. After all, Senator HATCH, we believe it better to wear tires out now have trying to make a living than to have them rot out sitting in sheds, and since tires are not to be had our people will use them as little as possible and for necessary trips and thereby do their own rationing, and, believe us, they will conserve their tires, for they realize now what it would mean to be without means of transportation.

Senator HATCH, we elected you to represent our interests in Washington, and we still believe in you, and we know you will use your very best efforts in representing us and to our best interests; we ask for nothing unfair, but since conditions in the West are so far from being the conditions in the East it becomes one question which cannot become universal and with the best interests of many thousands of people.

Just suppose, for instance, that some man or woman here at Quemado became ill and should be taken to a hospital and could get but 3 gallons of gas in each week, well, the best that could be done would be to reach Albuquerque in 3 weeks. As far as we in western New Mexico, eastern Arizona, and many other communities in the Western

States, it is all too absurd to think of; therefore we appeal to you for what seems to us as our very existence.

Sincerely yours,

QUEMADO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
 E. E. ENGLE, Secretary.

PUBLICATION OF PEACE CONFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, Dr. Herbert Wright has been professor of international law at the Catholic University of America for the past 12 years. He is also chairman of the committee of the American Society of International Law on publications of the Department of State. He has written me a very interesting letter dealing with the publication of peace conference documents touching the activities of the Department of State in the first World War. I ask consent of the Senate that the letter of Dr. Wright be published as a part of my remarks, rather than in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 8, 1942.
 The Honorable HOMER T. BONE,
 United States Senate,
 Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BONE: You will remember that in the middle of June 1938 you somewhat impatiently asked on the floor of the Senate, "When is the Department of State going to publish the peace conference documents?" And you pointed to the fact that other nations were printing portions of these documents which amounted to ex parte defenses of their activities at the Paris Peace Conference, whereas the United States was exceedingly slow in publishing the records of the conference giving the complete picture of the conference and the role played by the United States therein.

Action was taken by the Congress to speed up this publication, but now its continuation, as well as the continuation of the publication of the regular volumes of Foreign Relations and of the Department of State Bulletin, is being jeopardized, unintentionally, as I believe, by the action of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in subjecting the printing and binding appropriation for the Department of State to a blanket 40-percent reduction, as recently reported out by that committee and agreed to by the Senate on May 21.

If this reduction is left applicable to the Department of State printing, very probably it will fall heaviest upon the three publications mentioned. The object of the Senate committee amendment was stated by Senator PAT McCARRAN on May 21, when, in reply to a query from Senator JOHN A. DANAHY on this point, he said that "the printing and binding can be curtailed in accordance with the desires of those in charge of the Department. That which is most essential can be produced and that which is least essential can be curtailed."

In practice, this would probably mean that the officials of the Department would feel obliged to use this appropriation primarily for the Proclaimed List of Blocked Nationals (the so-called blacklist), passports, letterheads, and forms used in the day-by-day business of the Department and (what is possibly not realized) of the far-flung Foreign Service in the field abroad (the total for which will probably run well over \$100,000) and therefore the proposed reduction would necessarily fall on those publications which are not in the category of supplies for the routine operations of the Department. In

fact, upon inquiry, I have been informed by officials of the Department that, if the appropriation is reduced from \$254,000 to \$152,400, and even if the Department is given the discretion suggested by Senator McCARRAN, there will not be sufficient funds for the three publications named.

The item for printing and binding in the Department of State has always been very modest. In fact, almost 2 hours of the recent single-day meeting of the American Society of International Law were devoted to a discussion of the importance of these publications of the Department, in the course of which several members criticized me, as the chairman of their committee on publications of the Department of State, for not requesting a more expanded publication policy. I defended myself on the ground that, however desirable an expanded publication policy might be, during the war period we should ask for only those publications which we considered indispensable, even from the standpoint of economy, and I vigorously defended the House figures on that basis.

The fact that the Paris Peace Conference volumes have been long overdue, you yourself pointed out in 1938. As a result of your own interest and the interest of many others in the publication of these important documents, the Congress authorized and the Department of State embarked upon their publication, the first two volumes of which will probably appear this fall. The present plan is to proceed at the rate of four volumes a year. The material for volumes III and IV is already in galley proof and the material for volumes V and VI is being edited.

If your complaint was justified in 1938, and no one seriously doubts that it was amply justified, it would be doubly justified now, when we are engaged in another catastrophic world conflict with the prospect of many of the same problems arising in the peace conference that is bound to come. How are we to avoid the pitfalls of the Paris Peace Conference, which many, rightly or wrongly, believe left the way open for the outbreak of the present war, unless we know exactly what transpired there, unless we know precisely the role played by the delegates of each nation participating in that conference? The documents and records of that conference should prove of inestimable value in the conference to come. But if they are to be available then, their publication must not be interrupted now.

With regard to the regular foreign relations volumes, may I respectfully point out that, inaugurated in 1861, they have weathered the Civil War, the Spanish American War, and even the World War. At present, through no fault of the Department of State, there is a 15-year gap between the date of publication and the date of the documents contained therein. The Department, under constant urgings of the Congress, has been making every effort to cut down this gap. Two 1927 volumes have just appeared and there is a good prospect that the 1928 volumes will also appear during the present calendar year, thus cutting down the gap to 14 years. A suspension now would aggravate a situation now in process of being corrected. The specific volumes upon which the cut would presumably fall would be those for the year 1931, containing important documents relevant to Japan's embarkation upon her imperialistic spree.

The weekly bulletin, containing the more important releases of the Department, information concerning treaties to which the United States is a party and other information on foreign policy, is relied upon by the Congress itself, the Navy Department, the Department of Justice, the Office of Facts and Figures, the Office of the Coordinator of Information, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and other agencies of the Government itself as well as professors

and practitioners of international law and related subjects to keep themselves accurately informed concerning the multitudinous relations of the United States with foreign nations.

Resolutions in urgent support of the above publication program of the Department of State have been adopted in recent years by the following scientific and professional organizations, in the interest of making the public more reliably informed of their Government's activities in international affairs and the reasons therefor: American Bar Association, American Branch of the International Law Association, American Society of International Law, American Historical Association, American Political Science Association, Conference of Teachers of International Law and Related Subjects. Copies of these resolutions will be furnished on request.

If the Government desires to retain the confidence of the people of the United States in the battle for the survival of democracy, surely now is not the time to take any steps that could justly be considered as a suppression of the record of its activities in the international field or as a reversion to the extremes of secret diplomacy. Therefore, as Chairman of the Committee on Publications of the Department of State of the American Society of International Law, may I respectfully request that the figures for printing and binding Department of State publications authorized in the original bill as it came from the House be restored and that the Congress make clear to the Department that in any event the publication of the Foreign Relations, the Department of State Bulletin and the Paris Peace Conference volumes should not be curtailed. Since the Department's publication program is of such limited character, our committee believe that even a compromise between the House and Senate figures would not provide a satisfactory solution of the problem, since it would jeopardize the publications mentioned and in the end would prove to be a false economy.

Any substantiation or amplification of the above points which you might desire will be cheerfully furnished upon request. For your information, may I identify the other members of our committee: Prof. Kenneth W. Colegrove, Northwestern University; Prof. Walter H. E. Jaeger, Georgetown University School of Law; Prof. Philip C. Jessup, Columbia University; Mr. Stanley C. Smith, member of the District of Columbia Bar; Prof. Graham H. Stuart, Stanford University; and Mr. Charles Warren, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States. The undersigned has been professor of international law at the Catholic University of America for the past 12 years. Copies of our annual reports for 1939, 1940, and 1941 are sent herewith for your convenience.

In adopting our 1942 report, which is now in press, and continuing our committee for another year, the American Society of International Law, of which Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah is a vice president, at its annual meeting on April 25, 1942, adopted a resolution containing the following preamble:

"Whereas this society has heretofore recorded and desires to record again its conviction of the importance of the publication of significant state papers at the earliest moment which the Department of State may consider to be possible, if not incompatible with the public interest; and

"Whereas this society would deprecate any delay in the publication of any document or information which the Department of State decides it is possible, without danger to the public interest, to release:

"Resolved, That the Society continue," etc. The above information has been communicated to Senator McCARRAN and Representative RABAUT of the conference committee on

H. R. 6599, but I would appreciate it if you would have this letter inserted in the RECORD during the morning hour, so that it may be made available to all of the Members of both Houses of the Congress.

Very respectfully,

HERBERT WRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Publications of
the Department of State, American Society
of International Law.

RATIONING OF SUGAR

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I desire to place in the RECORD a letter from Mr. H. A. Benning, of Ogden, Utah, president of the Amalgamated Sugar Co., one of the largest processors of sugar in the area which includes Idaho.

In Mr. Benning's opinion the present rationing of sugar is much too severe. It is his belief that stocks of sugar are sufficiently large to make any rationing unnecessary. He states that his own company is having difficulty in marketing its product, due to restrictions upon purchases by consumers, and may be forced to curtail operations, with serious consequences to the growers of sugar beets.

Mr. Benning thinks that both the weekly allowance of sugar per person and the annual allowance for canning are too small.

In offering Mr. Benning's views I have no desire to interfere with a proper control of commodities of which there may be a shortage. It appears, however, that there has been considerable bungling in the handling of supplies of many commodities required by our people.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Benning's letter be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMALGAMATED SUGAR CO.,
Ogden, Utah, May 19, 1942.

HON. JOHN THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The present sugar ration of 8 ounces per week per person for domestic use and 5 pounds per year per person for home canning is entirely too small both from the consumers' needs and the available sugar supply standpoint.

Take our particular case: We produced 2,133,336 bags of 100 pounds each during our last operating season. We still have 1,393,860 bags of this sugar unsold and at the present time, when sugar is supposed to be scarce, we are unable to make sales in anywhere near the quantity we should be selling in order to market our stock before new production comes on.

This means that during the 7-month period, since we began producing the 1941 crop, we have only marketed 740,000 bags of that crop, and we have over 65 percent of it left with only 5 months remaining to sell it. At the present rate of our sales, we will have between eight and nine hundred thousand bags unsold when the new crop comes on.

The 1942 production will be considerably greater than normal, and in our case we will be faced with a situation which may be very serious unless the Government gives us relief. This is the situation: We expect to produce 3,000,000 bags of sugar and, starting out with 850,000 bags on hand, makes a total of 3,850,000 bags on hand at the end of the oper-

ating period, less sales during that period. At the present rate of sales we can expect 3,500,000 bags on hand when we finish processing the 1942 crop.

We have storage facilities for 2,500,000 bags and are faced with the problem of moving 1,000,000 during the fall when railroad equipment is hard to get, and also the problem of obtaining outside storage, which is almost impossible to get under present conditions. Sugar cannot be stored outdoors; therefore, we may be faced with a situation where our plants may be forced to shut down with a perishable crop on our hands. In that case the grower is the loser, as our contract with them protects us in such cases.

I am sure that this same situation applies to other processors. It can be corrected by increasing the sugar ration, which should be done without delay. The loss due to the restricted consumption cannot be recovered, but consumption can be renewed upon a more normal basis by increasing the ration to 1 pound per week per person and 30 pounds per person for canning, which would be entirely safe considering the available supplies.

All of the reliable sugar statisticians are convinced that there is enough sugar available so that rationing is unnecessary. It is a certainty that, if the present rationing is continued, all of the present producing areas, including Cuba, will be faced with a very serious problem. It is true that difficulty is being experienced at the present time moving Cuban and Puerto Rican sugars to the mainland, but this situation will be met and when it is, it will be very unfortunate for all concerned to find a large surplus of continental sugars backed up.

Yours very truly,

H. A. BENNING, President.

SHORTAGE OF GASOLINE, FUEL OIL, AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on May 14, 1942, acting for the so-called Oil Shortage Committee of the Senate, I addressed a letter to Mr. Leon Henderson, head of the Office of Price Administration; one to Mr. Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Coordinator; and one to Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, in connection with two problems which are causing great concern throughout the country.

At that time I asked that the special committee of which I am chairman be advised concerning the rubber shortage and the shortage of gasoline transportation facilities, and that it be given whatever information was available on the question of gasoline rationing.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of my letter and a copy of each of the replies which I received from the gentlemen I have just mentioned.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 14, 1942.

HON. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Coordinator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the past few weeks I have received many urgent suggestions that the Special Committee to Investigate Shortages of Gasoline, Fuel Oil, and Petroleum Products undertake a more intensive study—and hold hearings—in connection with the rationing of gasoline and the shortage of petroleum products in the Eastern States area.

For obvious reasons, I am hopeful that public hearings may be avoided; but I am

particularly anxious, as are all of the members of our committee, that we make every possible contribution to the gasoline problem, which is at least partially due to the shortage of transportation facilities. I have not wanted to unnecessarily bother executives and department officials who are extremely busy, and have been hopeful that all worthwhile information available might be submitted to us by mail. Some members of the Senate have felt that our committee should hold hearings. The pressure is great, and there is a likelihood that it will increase.

Is it reasonable that I request that you delegate someone under your jurisdiction to furnish me and the committee, of which I am chairman, with all available information that you feel we should have and are entitled to? I am personally confident that you are doing and have done everything that you felt could be done to relieve the situation, but I likewise feel that if we are better informed we can be helpful. If there are prospects for increased transportation facilities by water, and particularly over inland waterways, we should like to know about it. Can you tell me anything of the immediate prospects for an increase in the use of barges or other shipping facilities? Can you tell me what is "news" concerning the greater use of tank trucks? Can you tell me what future promise there is in the pipe-lines situation? Can you tell me whether or not any pipe lines from the east-coast area are being used to transport petroleum toward the West, or whether or not all existing pipe lines in the "distressed" States are being used to transport petroleum products to the "rationed" area?

If you will give me the information available on these subjects, and such other information as you can, I shall be very grateful. For obvious reasons, I should like to have it at the earliest possible time.

I am writing a similar letter to Price Administrator Leon Henderson; Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation; and Admiral E. S. Land; and I know, of course, that certain inquiries herein should not be directed to you.

For the consideration you will give this request I shall be grateful.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS MALONEY.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1942.

The Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: In response to your letter of May 14, the fuel-rationing branch of the Office of Price Administration has prepared the enclosed study on Nationwide Gasoline Rationing and the Conservation of Passenger Automobile Tires. This study may be of interest to your committee, since it demonstrates that gasoline rationing would be necessary even in the absence of a gasoline shortage.

If I can be of any further assistance to you, do not hesitate to call upon me.

Very truly yours,

LEON HENDERSON,
Administrator.

NATION-WIDE GASOLINE RATIONING AND THE CONSERVATION OF PASSENGER AUTOMOBILE TIRES

(Prepared by Office of Price Administration, Fuel Rationing Branch, Research and Analysis Section, for submission to the Special Senate Committee to Investigate Shortage of Gasoline, Fuel Oil, and Petroleum Products)

I. SUMMARY

1. A total of less than 5,000,000 new tires are available for use on private passenger automobiles during 1942, 1943, and 1944.

2. Present plans call for only 6,000,000 passenger car tires top-caps annually.

3. The 27,000,000 passenger automobiles equipped with tires that were put in service before January 1942, are the country's major source of passenger transportation for the next 3 years.

4. If 1941 driving habits continue, only 4.6 million passenger cars will be on the roads on January 1, 1945.

5. Nation-wide gasoline rationing would keep at least 8.5 million passenger automobiles in service through 1944.

6. No combination of tire conservation measures, that does not include Nation-wide gasoline rationing, can hope to avert a serious transportation crisis.

II. SUPPLY OF PASSENGER CAR TIRE REPLACEMENTS IS VERY LIMITED

For at least 2 years, the only passenger car tire replacements will be the tires which were in stock pile and on new cars on the first of this year, plus a limited quantity of reclaim for top-caps. Only an infinitesimal quantity of crude rubber can be released for passenger car use, and an excess of synthetic rubber production over military requirements is not yet assured.

Passenger car tires in inventory on January 1, 1942, are officially reported to number 8,000,000. However, this estimate is admittedly conservative. Rough calculations based upon Rubber Manufacturers Association reports produce a figure that is 1,600,000 higher. Accordingly, it is probable that the actual number of new tires in stock at the beginning of this year was in the neighborhood of 9,600,000.

Unfortunately, not all of these tires can be distributed to passenger-car owners. During the first 4 months of this year only 47.4 percent of the tires released by the Office of Price Administration, Tire Rationing Branch were put on passenger automobiles. The remainder went to the operators of small trucks. Expected stiffening of tire eligibility requirements and the fact that trucks consume tires at a faster rate than do passenger cars make it probable that only one-third of the January 1, 1942, inventory, or a total of 3,000,000 tires will be available for passenger-car use.

The Office of Price Administration, Automobile Rationing Branch, will release 400,000 passenger cars in 1942 and 135,000 in 1943. The proportion of these vehicles that will go to the Army is not known. A reasonable guess is that 75 percent of the cars rationed in 1942, and 50 percent of those released in 1943, will go to civilians. Using these percentages, a total of 368,000 new cars are available for nonmilitary use in the next 2 years. Since the tires on these automobiles were not included in the 9,000,000 tire inventory figure, the total of new tires for private passenger car use in future years must be revised upward to 4,840,000. This is less than one-sixth the number of tires sold for replacement purposes in 1941.

Present War Production Board plans call for supplying passenger car owners with 6,000,000 top caps per year. These caps, as provided by the new Victory Tire formula, contain 2 percent crude and 74 percent reclaimed rubber and will weigh on the average slightly less than 7 pounds each. The total of 13,875 tons of reclaim required annually by this program does not appear large when compared with this country's 350,000-ton reclaiming capacity. However, since 180,000 tons are needed each year for military purposes and for export, reclaiming plants must operate at greater than one-half their capacity before any reclaim can be supplied for civilian consumption. At any output less than 350,000 tons, top-capping requirements would probably be scaled down in order to meet other more pressing civilian needs.

If the rate of output achieved in January, February, and March is maintained, a little more than 300,000 tons of reclaim will be produced in 1942. This output would make possible fulfillment of most of the War Production Board top-capping program. How-

ever, reclaimers' stocks of scrap rubber declined by 45,821 tons from December 31, 1941, to February 28, 1942. Since total stocks on February 28, 1942, were only 154,747 tons, continuance of this rate of decline would cause complete cessation of reclaiming operations by the middle of September of this year. If the fall in stocks that occurred in February alone is projected into the future, an only moderately more cheering picture results. Continuance of the February rate of decline would postpone the shutting down of reclaiming plants until the middle of February 1943.

The drying up of the flow of scrap rubber to reclaimers may be due to either, or both, of two causes. Scrap dealers may be hoarding scrap in hope of rising prices; or current methods of collecting scrap from the public may be inadequate. It is unlikely that an actual shortage of scrap rubber now exists, or will exist for several years, since estimates of the amount of scrap in existence run from 800,000 to 10,000,000 tons. Even if the lower of these figures proves correct, rubber products scrapped in the future should prevent any real scrap shortage from arising (at the present rate of reclaiming), earlier than sometime in 1945. If the problem of reclaiming synthetic rubber has been solved by that time, the scrap shortage will be further postponed.

Even if improvement in the scrap situation were to make possible the top capping of 6,000,000 passenger-car tires this year and in future years, there is no reason to regard the motor transport problem as solved. Preliminary results of road tests being conducted by the National Bureau of Standards indicate that at speeds less than 40 miles per hour a 74-percent reclaim top cap will wear out in less than 6,000 miles. This means that at best the top-capping program will add 36,000,000 miles to passenger car mileage each year, which is only 15.17 percent of the distance traveled by passenger cars in 1940. Looked at another way, 6,000,000 top caps will equip 1,263,579 cars (at 4.75 tires per car) and allow them to run 6,000 miles per year. This number is 16 percent of the 7,500,000 cars which it is estimated are absolutely essential to the success of the war production program.

In short, fulfillment of present plans for top capping passenger-car tires will only slightly check the fall in the number of cars that can be kept in operation. The decline in scrap available for reclaiming makes doubtful the realization of even these modest plans.

Table I shows the crude and synthetic rubber position of the United Nations for 1942 and 1943. It was drawn up by the Office of the Coordinator for Rubber on the assumption that no synthetic rubber and only about 500 tons of crude (to be used in top caps) could be allotted to passenger-car owners in 1942 and 1943. The deficit shown at the end of 1943 indicates how impossible it would be to alter this assumption without curtailing some other type of use.

Such curtailment appears to be impossible. The requirement estimates shown in the table are in all cases either at or below the minimum amounts necessary to the prosecution of the war. Provision for the needs of most Latin-American countries has been eliminated. Estimates for Russia that were used by the War Production Board in March have been cut almost in half. American civilians are allotted, in 1942 and 1943 combined, only 39 percent as much rubber as they consumed in the single year 1941. Lend-lease, United States Navy, and Maritime Commission estimates represent absolute minima. And the figures used for the United States Army and Air Corps have not yet been accepted by the military authorities.

The supply side of the crude and synthetic picture likewise offers no hope of squeezing out some rubber for passenger cars. A significant improvement in the crude-rubber situation within the next few years can occur only if the Japanese are driven from south-

eastern Asia. Increased output in Brazil and other tropical rubber-producing areas accessible to the United Nations can be effected only after several years of intensive effort. Similarly little can be expected in the near future from native rubber plants, such as guayule. The synthetic supply picture is no better. Less than complete unanimity exists on the attainability of the 300,000-ton output planned for 1943. Recent action by the Coordinator for Rubber to raise synthetic production goals may result in an improved situation in 1944, but prospects for 1943 are not likely to be affected.

TABLE I.—Consolidated crude and synthetic rubber position of the United Nations for 1942 and 1943

1942 (THOUSAND LONG TONS)	
Sources of supply:	
Stock pile Jan. 1, 1942.....	706
New crude, less sinkings.....	453
Synthetic production, United States of America.....	28
Synthetic production, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.....	54
Total supply, 1942.....	1,241
Requirements:	
U. S. Army and Air Corps.....	242
U. S. Navy and Maritime Commission.....	29
Lend-Lease.....	82
Civilian.....	150
Other countries.....	310
Total requirements, 1942.....	813
Surplus, end of 1942.....	428
1943 (THOUSAND LONG TONS)	
Sources of supply:	
Stock pile, Jan. 1, 1943.....	428
New crude, less sinkings.....	61
Synthetic production, United States of America.....	300
Synthetic production, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.....	72
Total supply, 1943.....	861
Requirements:	
U. S. Army and Air Corps.....	356
U. S. Navy and Maritime Commission.....	37
Lease-Lend.....	82
Civilian.....	120
Other countries.....	271
Total requirements, 1943.....	866
Deficit, end of 1943.....	5

Even if the estimates in table I were miraculously to prove pessimistic, only the prospective appearance of a 150,000-ton surplus at the end of 1943 could release any rubber for passenger-car tires or recaps. The Requirements Committee of War Production Board has declared that it is imperative that this amount of crude rubber be available for combining with synthetic in 1944 and subsequent years. The conclusion is inescapable that, until 1944, at least, no crude or synthetic rubber can be used to keep passenger cars in operation.

It is possible that sufficient synthetic rubber will be produced in 1944 to permit the manufacture of some passenger-car tires in that year. However, since this is merely a possibility, it is more prudent to assume that replacements for passenger-car tires for the years 1942 through 1944 will be limited to 4,840,000 new tires, plus 18,000,000 top caps. If the average top cap lasts 1 year and if the average new tire lasts 3 years, these two sources will keep 2,283,000 cars (at 4.75 tires per car) on the roads through 1944. All other cars in service at the end of that year will be using tires that were in use before January 1, 1942.

LXXXVIII—314

III. CONTINUANCE OF 1941 DRIVING HABITS WOULD RAPIDLY WEAR OUT EXISTING TIRES

Chart I¹ shows the decline in the number of passenger automobiles that could be kept in service if 1941 driving habits were continued. Comparison of the line depicting total cars on the roads with that for cars using tires received before January 1, 1942, indicates the relative unimportance of the tire replacements available after that date.

The seriousness of the threatened retirement of over five-sixths of our passenger cars by the end of 1944 can be appreciated upon consideration of the importance of the private automobile in the national economy. Estimates of the number of passenger cars that are essential to the operation of the economy run from as low as 7,500,000 to as high as 20,000,000. Differences between various estimates are probably the result of different assumptions as to the degree of control over automobile use that will be exercised in the future. Thus, the 20,000,000 figure may be applicable to a situation involving very little modification of present car-use habits. The 7,500,000 estimate might be appropriate if only essential driving were permitted and if drastic measures were taken to enforce the most efficient use of all transportation facilities.

If only 7,500,000 passenger automobiles are regarded as indispensable, insurmountable difficulties will not be encountered until the spring of 1944.

If the correct figure is 20,000,000, problems will arise as early as this summer. In either case, the picture presented is extremely serious. The necessity for vigorous action to conserve the disappearing stock of passenger-car tires cannot be questioned.

IV. METHODS OF DEALING WITH THE PASSENGER-CAR TIRE PROBLEM

The numerous suggestions for avoiding, postponing, or lessening the effect of the threatened disappearance of passenger cars from the highways may be classified under four heads:

A. Increasing the capacity and regulating the use of local public transit systems

Large-scale provision of new transit equipment is precluded by the shortages of metals. New busses have the special disadvantage of requiring, on the average, 90 pounds of crude rubber per bus for tires. Staggering hours to spread peak loads and limiting transit privileges to persons traveling in connection with war work would replace only part of the essential transportation service now provided by passenger cars. Private automobiles traveled almost 500,000,000,000 passenger-miles in 1939; busses and electric railways, under 50,000,000,000. If only 40 percent of the private automobile passenger-miles were regarded as absolutely essential, and if busses and electric railways were to double their 1939 record—a practical impossibility—150,000,000,000 essential passenger-miles would be required of private automobiles. If each car averaged a load of 2½ persons—the present figure is 1.7—and traveled 10,000 miles per year, the services of 6,000,000 passenger cars would still be necessary. Improving local public transit facilities and planning for their more efficient use are indispensable projects but they fall short of solving the transportation problem.

B. Better tire care

It is demonstrated in appendix B that a 10-percent increase in tire mileage is easily attainable if methods can be found to induce car owners to take better care of their tires. A publicity campaign with this end in view is already under way, but more direct action seems called for. Specifically, a Nation-wide 40-mile-per-hour speed limit should be im-

¹ See appendix A for method used in calculating figures used in the chart.

posed at once. The advisability of a system of compulsory tire inspections, however, is debatable, in view of the tremendous administrative problem involved. The principal advantages of inspections would be to educate the car owner in approved methods of tire care and to make certain that tires are not worn beyond the point where recapping is still possible. Whether or not these advantages overbalance the administrative difficulties increased tire care is only one way to prolong tire life. The elimination of all non-essential mileage is a still more promising conservation move.

C. Requisitioning tires or automobiles

One way to curtail unnecessary driving is to retire a large number of cars from active use through Federal purchase of either the tires on such cars or the cars themselves. Both measures involve the same kind of difficulties—complex administrative problems, inadequate storage facilities, and possible inflationary effects of the financial outlay involved. The last two difficulties would be more acute in the case of cars than in that of tires. But this is counterbalanced by the fact that requisitioning tires would likely result in greater deterioration of the cars affected than would occur if entire cars were put under Government supervision. The advantage seems to lie with the automobile purchase plan, since the Government would thereby acquire stock piles of automobiles and automobile parts, as well as a large number of tires.

Requisitioning automobiles should not be regarded as an alternative to gasoline rationing, but as an invaluable supplement to such a program. Some cars are used solely for nonessential purposes. Gasoline rationing cannot completely immobilize nonessential automobiles without risking rapid deterioration of tires. Under an automobile requisitioning plan the Government can ensure proper storage of tires and reserve them for essential transportation needs. In view of the urgency of the tire problem, achievement of this end more than compensates for any difficulties entailed in a large-scale requisitioning program.

D. Elimination of unnecessary use of cars left in private hands

Gasoline rationing is the only satisfactory method of reducing unnecessary use of privately held automobiles. Local campaigns to encourage joint car use are desirable, but cannot have either the scope or the sanctions necessary for effectively dealing with the transportation problem. Tire rationing cannot regulate the use of tires in private hands.

The great advantage of gasoline rationing is that it is a means of continuous control over car use, which can be fitted to the essential driving requirements of each car owner. Moreover, it can be rapidly adjusted to conform to changes in the general transportation situation, or in the needs of individuals. Compared with its potentialities for enforcing conservation of tires, the administrative problems of a gasoline rationing system are insignificant.

The magnitude of the tire conservation that would be effected by establishing Nation-wide gasoline rationing on July 1 of this year is indicated in chart III. It should be noted that the only difference between the top line on this chart and the bottom line is that the former takes account of the estimated 15-percent reduction in mileage driven during the first half of 1942 and assumes the existence after July 1, 1942, of a national gasoline rationing system similar to the emergency plan now in effect along the Atlantic seaboard. No reductions of mileage are recognized beyond those enforced by gasoline rationing, nor is any increase in tire care over that prevailing in 1941 assumed. Both lines reflect the

anticipated results of tire, automobile, and top-cap rationing. In other words, the bottom line shows what would happen if car owners behaved in 1942, 1943, and 1944 exactly as they behaved in 1941; the top line depicts the radically different result that would obtain if mileage driven were curtailed by extension nationally of the present regional gasoline rationing system.

Chart III¹ indicates that even a relatively mild gasoline rationing system would maintain the number of passenger cars in use above 7,500,000 until the spring of 1945. Continuance of 1941 driving habits, on the other hand, would cause this danger point to be reached in the spring of 1944. The difference between 1944 and 1945 is more than merely a 1-year postponement of disaster. It is a 12-month period that may well be needed to solve the rubber problem and eliminate completely the threat of a transportation break-down. Synthetic rubber for passenger car tires is a probability in 1945; it is only a possibility in 1944.

Even if an optimistic view is taken of synthetic rubber prospects for 1944, the situation confronting the country in 1943 is more than serious enough to justify Nation-wide gasoline rationing. Continuance of 1941 driving practices would reduce the number of passenger automobiles on the roads to 8,672,000 by the end of 1943. If a national 40-mile-per-hour speed limit were to reduce tire wear for the year by 15 percent, if a publicity campaign for better tire care could save another 15 percent, and if voluntary mileage curtailment accounted for another 20 percent—all of which are very optimistic assumptions—only 15,000,000 cars would remain in service on January 1, 1944. This figure is scarcely more than one-half the cars that were in service at the outset of 1942. Moreover, it is 5,000,000 units under one estimate of the number of passenger automobiles that are essential to the operation of the national economy. It is certain that the country could not absorb so severe a cut in its major source of passenger transportation without production for war being adversely affected. Some workers would be unable to get to their present places of employment. Others would be late several times each week. Many would have their efficiency impaired due to the necessity of using inconvenient or exhausting means of getting to and from work.

Under the best circumstances that are conceivable, failure to institute national gasoline rationing in the middle of 1942 will produce in 1943 a situation which will seriously threaten the success of the war-production program. Gasoline rationing will result in at least the amount of passenger-car conservation indicated in chart III. If necessary it could be used to prolong further the life of existing tires. More nonessential driving could be eliminated. Also, the rationing system could enforce more efficient car use through making compliance with doubling-up plans a condition to the receipt of supplementary ration coupons.

The seriousness of the passenger-car tire situation justifies the use of all appropriate means to conserve tires and to improve the utilization of dwindling passenger transportation facilities. However, no combination of measures that does not include Nation-wide gasoline rationing can hope to avert a real transportation crisis before the end of 1943.

APPENDIX A. EXPLANATION OF CHARTS

Chart I. Passenger automobiles in service, with continuance of 1941 driving habits

1. Major steps in calculating figures used:

(a) Data on quarterly shipments of passenger-car tires were arranged in frequency distribution on basis of miles driven annually.

¹ See Appendix A for method used in calculating figures in the chart.

(b) Assuming average tire to last for 20,000 miles, expiration dates were calculated for each of the age and mileage classes set up in "a."

(c) The number of tires still in service on any given date was computed by subtracting from total tires sold before that date the number of tires that should be worn out by that date.

(d) Tires were converted to cars on the assumption that each car has 4.75 tires.

(e) Adjustment was made for tires released by ration boards on the assumption that—

(1) The present rate of release will continue.

(2) The proportion of tires going to passenger-car owners (as opposed to small-truck owners) will fall linearly from its present level of less than 50 percent at a rate consistent with the distribution of only one-third of the total tire inventory to passenger-car owners.

(3) All tires released will last at least 3 years.

(4) Each car has 4.75 tires.

(f) Adjustment was made for new cars released by ration boards on the assumption that—

(1) Seventy-five percent of the 400,000 cars to be sold in 1942, and 50 percent of the 135,000 to be sold in 1943, will go to civilian users.

(2) The tires on new cars will last at least 3 years.

(g) Adjustment was made for the 6,000,000 top caps planned annually on the assumption that—

(1) A top cap will last 1 year.

(2) Each car has 4.75 tires.

2. Assumptions implicit in the above process:

(a) The proportion of drivers in each of the annual mileage classes (1a above) is the same each year.

(b) Habits of tire care (speed, inflation, wheel alignment, etc.) do not change.

(c) Any given tire is driven the same distance each year of its life.

(d) If any car owner is reduced to fewer tires than are needed to operate his car, he will immediately turn over his good tires to another owner who will put them to use.

3. The apparent inconsistency of the results for April 1, 1943, with the general trend of decline is probably due to the cumulative effect of several operations in which figures were rounded off to the nearest thousand. It is almost certain that the combined tire mortality of the first two quarters of 1943 will be spread evenly over the entire 6-month period, instead of being concentrated in the second quarter year.

Chart II. Passenger automobiles in service, with Nation-wide gasoline rationing

Comment on chart I is applicable to chart II with the following exceptions:

1. A 15-percent reduction in driving during the first 6 months of 1943 was assumed.

(a) Note that a 15-percent reduction in driving, due to the distribution of tire-life expectancies, resulted in a slightly smaller decrease in tire retirements.

2. An annual mileage frequency distribution consistent with the present eastern gasoline-rationing system was used after July 1, 1942.

Chart III. Passenger automobiles in service

This chart presents, for purposes of comparison, the totals arrived at in charts I and II.

APPENDIX B. EFFECT OF CARE UPON TIRE LIFE

Significant increases in tire mileage may be obtained by universal adoption of approved methods of tire conservation.

1. Tires driven at 40 miles per hour will last 30 percent longer than those driven at 50 miles per hour. If one-half of all passenger-car mileage is at speeds above 40 miles per hour and if the average for this faster half of the total mileage is roughly 50 miles

per hour, then the enforcement of a 40-mile-per-hour maximum speed limit would increase the lives of all passenger-car tires by at least 15 percent. The saving might be even greater because tire wear increases with speed more than linearly.

2. A driver who systematically changes the position of the tires upon his car will get at least 20 percent more tire mileage than a driver who does not make such changes. If one-half of all car owners do not today follow proper methods of tire rotation, a change in their habits could increase the mileage of all passenger-car tires by 10 percent.

3. Correction of tire underinflation of 10 percent will add 5½ percent to tire mileage. If one-half the tires are underinflated 10 percent over one-half the time, a 3 percent addition to the life of all passenger-car tires might be expected from correcting this condition.

4. The combined effects of the above improvements in tire care would add over 25 percent to the mileage obtainable from existing passenger-car tires. Certainly the results of vigorous measures directed at improving tire care could not fall below a 10-percent increase in tire mileage.

OFFICE OF PETROLEUM

COORDINATOR FOR WAR.

Washington, May 29, 1942.

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY,

Chairman, Special Committee to Investigate Shortages of Gasoline, Fuel Oil, and Petroleum Products, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: I have received your letter of May 14.

In response to the questions which you have asked therein relative to changes in the east-coast oil-supply situation, I am enclosing in duplicate a memorandum to me from E. B. Swanson, director of the Division of Research in the Petroleum Coordinator's office. This memorandum presents information as to the current status of the subjects about which you inquired.

In response to your request that I delegate someone in my office to furnish you and your committee with all available information which I feel you should have and are entitled to, I designate Mr. Swanson to act in this capacity. Appropriate arrangements should be made by you and your committee with Mr. Swanson for the submission of such information.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Coordinator for War.

OFFICE OF PETROLEUM COORDINATOR FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION

From: E. B. Swanson.

To: Secretary Ickes.

Date: May 25, 1942.

Subject: Information requested by Senator MALONEY.

1. Prospects for increased transportation facilities by water, particularly over inland waterways: The facilities for transporting oil to the east coast are of four types: (a) Direct tanker or barge shipments through the Straits of Florida; (b) tanker or barge shipments along the Gulf coast to points in west Florida, from where further movement now is possible by tank car; (c) barge shipments up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to western Pennsylvania and West Virginia; and (d) lake tanker and barge movements on the Great Lakes to western New York and eastward through the New York State Barge Canal.

Tanker movements depend upon the security which may be afforded. Because of diversions to military services and losses, damages, and delays through enemy action, it is indicated that tankers cannot be counted

upon for the regular movement of oil to the east coast.

Increased movement of oil to the east coast by barges must await the completion of certain pipe-line relaying and rerouting. There are not enough barges and towboats on hand or building to increase materially the present barge movements to the east coast. According to the final report of the Inland Barge Petroleum Transportation Committee, there are 851 steel barges in petroleum service, with a total cubic capacity of 6,423,298 barrels, and 76, with a total cubic capacity of 687,940 barrels, under construction. The same report shows that there are 329 towboats and tugs in petroleum service, with 2 building. In addition, there are 1,028 steel barges now used in various dry cargo services which are suitable for conversion to petroleum carriers. The use of these barges now is being analyzed by an industry committee to determine the possibility of substituting wooden barges and power therefor in order to release them for petroleum service.

If all of the 851 barges with related towing equipment, reported as now in constant use and service in carrying oil on inland waterways, could be and were put in a single service of moving petroleum from Texas to Pittsburgh (via Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mississippi and Ohio Rivers) allowing 47 days for a round-trip voyage, this entire equipment could deliver only 136,000 barrels per day to Pittsburgh (6,423,298 barrels divided by 47). Such a concentration would not be possible, as all of this equipment now is in constant use, a major part of which is essential. Further, some of the power equipment would not be suitable for use on the Ohio River.

Substantial rearrangement of normal facilities will be necessary before the present barge facilities can be expected to move much more oil to the east coast. For instance, barges now are used to transport gasoline from Gulf coast refineries to Baton Rouge, La., for movement eastward via the Plantation pipe line. Project 2b covers the construction from second-hand material of a 10-inch feeder line of 200 miles from Port Arthur to Baton Rouge, with a capacity of 60,000 barrels daily. This will eliminate the present need for barges or tankers in moving gasoline to Baton Rouge and make them available for other services. Those in charge of this project anticipate that 4 months will be required for its completion. There are other projects of a similar nature in which second-hand material will be used to lay or rearrange pipe lines to move oil overland to points on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, such as Helena, Ark., and Paducah, Ky., from where the oil will be moved east by a combination of barge and tank-car shipments. These changes will shorten the present inland-barge movements and enable the same number of barges to move larger quantities of oil over the shorter distances which then will be required for the barges.

Calculations made by the Transportation Division show that 350,000 tons of new steel will deliver the following quantities of crude oil per day from Port Arthur to the Philadelphia-New York refining area.

	Barrels per day
Tankers, normal conditions	505,500
Tankers, 75-percent efficiency	377,800
Tankers, present efficiency	302,500
Tank cars, including power	177,500
Pipe line	300,000
Barges, Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh, thence by pipe line ..	176,200

Project 4 covers the rearrangement of supplies in the Great Lakes region, an increase in the Great Lakes pipe-line movement and a reduction of lake tanker shipments to Duluth, all of which will permit diversion of

about 10,000 barrels daily from Chicago to Buffalo, by barge and lake tanker.

Attached is a report on the "Utility of Inland and Intracoastal Waterways for Movement of Petroleum and Petroleum Products," prepared by the Transportation Division.

2. The use of tank trucks: As of May 1, 1942, there were about 45,000 tank cars engaged in moving petroleum from Districts 2 and 3 into District 1. Of this number about 10,000 previously operated within District 1, 20,000 were taken from services within District 2, 13,000 from services within District 3, and 2,000 from services within District 4. Accordingly, 35,000 tank cars have been withdrawn from their normal services in Districts 2, 3, and 4 and placed in the east coast service. The transportation formerly supplied by these tank cars has been replaced largely by tank trucks.

Under Directive 50 and Office of Defense Transportation Orders Nos. 7 and 7B, it is estimated that an additional 15,000 tank cars will be withdrawn from their present services and diverted to the east coast service. Under these orders permits are required for tank-car movements within 100 miles of the shipping point. This will place an additional short-haul burden on tank trucks.

The tire situation is involved in the continued use of tank trucks to replace services previously performed by tank cars. Much of this service is to essential industries in the Middle West and, as the tires wear out and cannot be replaced, it is likely that a substantial number of the tank cars diverted to the east coast service may have to be recalled to the Middle West.

Accordingly, while it is estimated that the expected 60,000 tank cars may move 800,000 barrels daily to the east coast, other demands for some of the cars and other factors may limit the continued delivery of oil by tank car to the east coast to 600,000 barrels daily, according to competent opinion.

3. Reversal of eastern pipe lines: There are three pipe lines which previously transported gasoline westward from the Atlantic coast. All of these are being reversed.

The Tuscarora pipe line runs from the Bayonne, N. J., area to Midland, Pa., near the Ohio-Pennsylvania border, via Harrisburg, Pa. Gasoline now is pumped westward as far as Harrisburg, with the remainder of the line closed down. Pumps are now being set at Midland in order to pump gasoline east, which is expected to start about the middle of June. At that time it is planned to pump about 12,000 barrels daily from Midland to Harrisburg and possibly beyond.

The Susquehanna pipe line formerly moved gasoline from Philadelphia to Cleveland, but now is not pumping westward beyond York, Pa. At the western end of the line about 5,000 barrels daily of gasoline are being pumped eastward from Cleveland to Cessna.

The Keystone pipe line moved gasoline from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, via Reading and Harrisburg. The line now is pumping small quantities of gasoline westward as far as Harrisburg and about 4,000 barrels daily eastward from Pittsburgh. Crude oil now is being accumulated in the Pittsburgh area to fill the line, after which it will move 19,000 to 20,000 barrels daily of crude oil from Pittsburgh to Philadelphia. It is expected that this crude oil movement will start this week.

Project 3 covers the laying of a connecting line between the Sohio system at Tiffin, Ohio, and the Susquehanna system near Akron. This, or an alternative proposal involving barges between Toledo and Cleveland, will supply the 10,000 barrels daily of gasoline for movement eastward over the Susquehanna pipe line.

E. B. SWANSON,
Director of Research.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1942.

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of May 14 is received.

I am asking my assistant, Fayette B. Dow, to call upon you and discuss some of the subjects referred to. Others, as you suggest, do not come within my immediate jurisdiction.

I have issued an order which contains the framework of a comprehensive control over tank cars. As a start, the application of the permit system is limited to hauls within 100 miles, for which in some instances tank trucks are available, with a view of getting as many of the cars as possible into long-haul service, for which they are indispensable. We are studying all of the short hauls for which permits are asked, and, as we deal with each industry through contact committees as well as individual shippers, are endeavoring to reduce cross hauling on the longer movements. In many instances it has been possible to replace tank cars with tank trucks, thus releasing the cars for the long hauls to the East. Tank trucks are so much more efficient for short hauls that often one will replace several tank cars.

Your inquiry relates particularly to petroleum and the shortage in the Eastern States. From 70,000 barrels daily in the week before Pearl Harbor the movement to this area has steadily grown to more than 684,000 barrels a day last week. How much this movement can be increased is uncertain, depending, as it does, upon a number of factors. Some of these are (a) the car supply that can be made available and the maintenance of the cars in serviceable condition; (b) the extent to which hauls can be shortened by taking supplies from origins closer than the Southwestern States; (c) greater consolidation of shipments through the organization of cooperative receiving agencies making possible the unloading of the cars at centrally located terminals, from which the further distribution may be made by tank truck; and (d) the ability of the railroads to handle the traffic together with increases in other important traffic, such as coal to New England.

I think it can fairly be said that with respect to the rate of increase and the volume itself an excellent job has been done by the railroads and the shippers up to this time, but I feel that a substantial further improvement can be made. If, however, we work on the assumption—which I hope future developments will prove incorrect—that the movement of petroleum by tanker is out indefinitely, or that the volume by that agency will be small, the question of available tank-car supply becomes very important. This is because the rate of transportation by pipe line to the Atlantic seaboard area (now about 140,000 barrels per day) and by barge (now about 50,000 barrels per day) cannot be materially increased for some months at least.

Tank cars are needed for a large number of commodities essential to the war effort, such as vegetable oils, chemicals, and a growing volume of alcohol as a raw material for powder, although, of course, petroleum requires the largest number. Our surveys indicate an increased demand for tank cars for all of these important commodities. For example, data supplied by the Department of Agriculture indicate an increase in vegetable oils from 57,000 tank-car loads in 1941 to over 73,000 carloads in 1942.

Without burdening this letter with too much detail, the situation which we are facing clearly indicates the necessity of getting the greatest possible use out of a limited tank car supply. This can best be done in the case of oil to New England by train lot movements run solid from point of origin to a

single terminal at which the cars can be unloaded and started back empty, also in a solid block, within 24 hours. From this terminal the oil can be distributed by tank trucks. Several points within New England would, of course, be selected as terminals for such movements. Rapidity of turn around in rail-roading is gained mainly by avoidance of switching and reclassification in railroad yards. To accomplish this solid-train-to-one-terminal movement would require, I think, the organization of a single receiving agency by the New England oil companies. It was natural in the early stages of the unusual movement that the effort should have been made by the companies individually and that the carloads of petroleum products should have been billed to a diversity of destinations thus scattering the cars and delaying their return. But the fact that New England's requirements are several hundred carloads per day above the highest level yet reached calls now for a kind of planning which will enable the railroads to give the available cars the most rapid turn around that is practical.

Movement of oil in tank cars cannot be depended upon as a satisfactory agency of supply for any extended period of time, and will not meet all the needs even for a short period of time. Pipe lines are much more dependable and economical. A substantial enlargement of pipe-line capacity to the East should be made as rapidly as possible. While the shortage of steel is a factor which must be considered under immediate conditions, there is much that can be done by relaying existing pipe, and some steps are being taken in this direction.

The outlook for increased deliveries by pipe line to the East depends upon the accomplishment of two principal objectives:

First, the rearrangement and relocation of lines, including reversal of direction of flow, by the use of pipe available in present company and dealer stocks and additional footage obtained by removal of lines not presently being used to full capacity whose operations can be taken over by other companies having lines in the same general territory. This reconstruction is primarily dependent upon the correlated efforts of several pipe-line companies. No substantial progress has been made as far as actual construction is concerned, but these projects are well along in a final planned stage and more rapid progress can be expected from this point on.

Second. There are various projects still in the planning stages for the construction of lines which would require the allocation of new steel. One of these, for example, is a 20-inch line from east Texas to Salem, Ill., and another is the proposed 24-inch national defense line from east Texas to the eastern seaboard.

With reference to your question regarding westward movements of petroleum products from the east, there are no westward movements of crude oil. However, certain products lines are supplying the rationed area approximately as far west as the Susquehanna River. With these exceptions, lines which formerly pumped gasoline westward have either been reversed or are in process of reversal. Current plans call for completing the reversal of all of the west-bound gasoline lines.

So far as barge movements are concerned, oil is now being moved in this way up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh at the rate of about 50,000 barrels per day. There are two possibilities for increasing the movement by barge to the east. One is by use of the Intracoastal Waterway along the Atlantic coast. The other is by further use of the Mississippi River system. Both will require the construction of new equipment.

The Intracoastal Waterway is capable of operations by vessels of at least 11-foot draught from Jacksonville, Fla., to Trenton, N. J. Below Jacksonville, there is a waterway along the coast to Port Everglades, and one thence across the State through Lake Oke-

chobee. These, however, will not permit the operation of vessels of much more than 6-foot draught. Along the Gulf coast, there is a good protected waterway from Texas to Port St. Joe, Fla., but none from there south. Apparently the best plan for moving oil by use of these waterways would be to operate barges to Port St. Joe, then carry the oil in a pipe line to Jacksonville, and thence by barge north.

It appears that by relaying pipe now unused in the Southwest, such a pipe line from Port St. Joe to Jacksonville could be built in a comparatively short time, of a capacity of something like 60,000 barrels per day.

So far as the Mississippi River system is concerned, the opportunities for moving oil northbound are unlimited, being dependent only upon the equipment which can be made available.

Both projects are dependent for any extensive use upon the construction of new barge and towing equipment. It appears that steel cannot be made available. The only alternative is wood. I enclose herewith a report from our Regulated River Carriers Committee which will be of interest. The whole subject, however, is being further explored by a committee which the President has appointed and of which I am a member. In addition to questions which must be resolved concerning the type and design of wooden barges and towboats, there are other questions in regard to motive power. Diesel engines, which would be the best power units, are not available. The alternatives are steam engines and gasoline engines. We are looking into these possibilities.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Director.

REGULATED RIVER CARRIERS COMMITTEE,
Pittsburgh, Pa., May 18, 1942.

MR. EDWARD CLEMENS,
*Director, Division of Inland
Waterway Transport, Office of
Defense Transportation,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CLEMENS: Attached to our letter of February 11, 1942, we forwarded to you and again recommended the adoption of the Regulated River Carriers Committee report of November 1, 1941, made to the Under Secretary of Commerce concerning the necessity of expanding the transportation facilities on the Mississippi River system, including a definite recommendation for the institution of an emergency river towboat and barge pool to be established by the Government of the United States for the purpose of building towboats and barges to be chartered or leased to regulated water carriers.

This report reached Director Eastman of the Office of Defense Transportation; Under Secretary of Navy Forrestal; Mr. Gilbert, former Director of Transportation in the Petroleum Coordinator's Office; and has been called to the attention of Mr. Donald Nelson of the War Production Board and others.

Since that time we have been advised that critical materials are not available for the recommended construction of all of the towboats and barges. In the light of this development, it is the desire of the committee to amend the recommendations of November 1, 1941, in order that construction of additional floating equipment requiring the use of a lesser amount of critical materials may be promptly undertaken.

The committee has considered the matter from all angles, including the following:

A. Possible conversion to liquid-carrying units of existing steel barges designed for the transportation of other war commodities.

B. The construction of towboats and barges with the use of a lesser amount of critical materials (steel, etc.).

The conversion of existing barges we find would entail the immediate withdrawal of barges from the service of carrying other com-

modities, principally war materials, in which they are now engaged. There are no surplus barges upon which conversion might be undertaken. The conversion to liquid-carrying units of standard steel barges known as Hopper type, 175 by 26 by 11 feet, which were built for the carrying of commodities not requiring protection from the weather would require approximately 50 tons of steel each, including piping and pumping equipment, and the steel Hopper barge 195 by 35 by 11 feet would require approximately 100 tons of steel, including piping and pumping equipment. Under existing conditions a period of approximately 45 days after the receipt of materials would be required for the conversion. If conversion were accomplished, it would be necessary to replace such converted barges in order to handle the vital war materials now being transported in them.

The original recommendation of the committee contemplated the building of towboats and barges according to the best design and practice obtaining on the rivers. It did not contemplate the use of wood in any hulls or in the superstructure of the boats except to a very limited extent. It did contemplate the use of Diesel engines for power. While it is admitted that barges can be constructed of wood, barges of such construction would require more power to handle than modern steel barges, and in the hauling of inflammable and combustible petroleum products they present a fire hazard to wharves, barges, cargoes, the accompanying towboats, and to locks and dams, if operating on rivers so equipped; the committee, therefore, recommends against the employment of wooden barges in the transportation of petroleum products in such stretches of the rivers.

Towboats with wooden hulls can be built, but it is the opinion of the committee that wooden boats powered sufficiently heavy to handle large tows would not be practical.

RECOMMENDATION

In view of the changed situation, particularly as to critical materials available for constructing river equipment, and the demand for the transportation of petroleum products, this committee recommends:

1. That there be constructed 100,000 tons capacity in wooden barges to be used for the transportation of petroleum products in bulk upstream on the Mississippi River as far as Cairo, Ill., for Ohio River, upper Mississippi River, and Illinois River destinations.

2. That the cargoes from the wooden barges be transferred to steel barges for transportation through the portions of the rivers which are slack watered by the use of locks and dams. It is recognized that direct transfer between wooden barges and steel barges could not be accomplished efficiently and without considerable towboat and barge delay except through a bulk storage plant erected in the vicinity of Cairo, Ill. This contemplates the withdrawal of an equivalent number of steel barges from service between New Orleans and Cairo to the service on the locked rivers.

3. That the wooden barges be loaded with the lower grades of petroleum products.

4. That there be constructed 150,000 tons capacity of wooden open barges for the handling of bulk commodities such as coal, sulfur, etc., which stow evenly over the surface of the barge.

5. That there be constructed the following towboats and tugs: Nine 2,000-horsepower towboats (steel hulls); nine 1,000-1,500-horsepower towboats (steel hulls); nine 600-750-horsepower boats and tugs (steel or wood hulls).

It is recommended that these boats be either stern-wheel or screw driven, dependent upon the character of the engines available and that steam equipment be used to the extent that Diesel engines cannot be provided.

Attention is drawn to the fact that additional towboats are even now of greater necessity than additional barges. There is

now enough power available to expeditiously move existing loaded barges up the waters of the Mississippi River System.

These recommendations are made with the knowledge that the available supply of skilled workmen, such as caulkers and ship carpenters, may not be adequate to accomplish such a comprehensive program with dispatch.

We have not attempted to go into the detailed design and the cost of the boats or barges, but if our recommendations meet with approval, the committee stands ready and willing to assist in this matter.

Very truly yours,

REGULATED RIVER CARRIERS COMMITTEE,
ANDREW P. CALHOUN, *Chairman*.

OIL PIPE LINE ACROSS NORTHERN FLORIDA

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I present a letter from Petroleum Coordinator Harold L. Ickes which indicates that without the necessity of any legislation, and without the necessity of any direct appropriation, it is entirely possible to have an oil pipe line across northern Florida in operation within 120 days after construction begins. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PETROLEUM
COORDINATOR FOR WAR,
Washington, June 8, 1942.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: This will acknowledge your letter of June 5 asking to be advised as to the present status of the project endorsed by this office for the construction of a petroleum products pipe line across northern Florida from Port St. Joe to Jacksonville.

Two proposals have been submitted in connection with this project, each of which contemplates an 8-inch line which would deliver from 35,000 to 40,000 barrels of petroleum products daily to Jacksonville.

The first proposal for the construction of such a line, to cost approximately \$3,000,000, was submitted by the American Liberty Pipe Line Co. On June 2, after studies had been conducted by my staff in collaboration with the Office of Defense Transportation, an appraisal of the proposal was submitted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, from whom the American Liberty Pipe Line Co. is seeking a loan to finance the construction of the line. I have not as yet been informed of the decision of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on this matter. However, the company has assured me that it is ready to proceed with the construction of the line immediately if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation grants the loan, and that the line can be in operation within 120 days after the beginning of construction.

On June 1 this office received another proposal for the construction of a 10-inch line over substantially the same route. This proposal was made by the Sublim Oilbarge Co. and was amended on June 4, reducing to 8 inches the diameter of the proposed line because the company found that it would be unable to obtain second-hand 10-inch pipe and equipment. This proposal is now being appraised by my staff in collaboration with the Office of Defense Transportation. This proposal also contemplates Reconstruction Finance Corporation financing and our appraisal will be submitted to Reconstruction Finance Corporation within the next few days.

Because of the shortage of steel-barge equipment required to deliver products to Port St. Joe for movement through the line and to distribute the products from the Jacksonville terminus, it is the view of this office that only one products pipe line across Florida is justified at this time. If it is found that the two pipe-line proposals are equally satisfactory from the standpoint of this office, the decision as to which company should receive governmental financial assistance would be determined by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I wish to emphasize that the construction of a pipe line across northern Florida would provide only a small, although important, part of the necessary overland and protected waterways transportation facilities for moving petroleum to the shortage areas of the east coast. The various other measures advocated by this office and outlined by Mr. Parten to the Senate Committee on Commerce, including the relocation of existing pipe lines, the building of additional inland waterways equipment, and the construction of a 24-inch pipe line from Texas to the east coast, would, of course, remain essential to the successful solution of this critical problem.

My views on the proposal for a pipe line and a barge canal across central Florida are set forth in full in the report on S. 2426 which I submitted to Senator BAILEY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce.

If you wish any further information on this matter I shall be pleased to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Coordinator for War.

FREE LEGAL SERVICES TO OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN—LETTER BY SENATOR DANAHER

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Senator DANAHER, together with a newspaper article, relative to free legal services to officers and enlisted men, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S LEADERSHIP IN THE WORLD'S CRISIS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject America's Leadership in the World's Crisis, delivered by him at the Holy Name breakfast of the postal employees, Buffalo, N. Y., on May 31, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES TO AMERICAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD messages presented in behalf of many of the United Nations at the second annual dinner of the American Palestine Committee, Washington, D. C., May 25, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PASTORAL LETTER OF MARCH 22, 1942, OF GERMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the pastoral letter of German bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, read in the churches on Passion Sunday, March 22, 1942, published in the New York Times of June 7, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRAIGHT THINKING ON GASOLINE RATIONING—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Alf M. Landon before the Executive

Club, Chicago, Ill., Friday, June 5, 1942, on the subject Straight Thinking on Gasoline Rationing, which appears in the Appendix.]

IUS GENTIUM—ADDRESS BY MAX RADIN

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Ius Gentium," delivered by Prof. Max Radin at Boalt Hall, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., which appears in the Appendix.]

FUNDAMENTALS OF FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY E. E. WILSON

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by E. E. Wilson, president of the United Aircraft Corporation, delivered at the Union League Club of Chicago on May 28, on the subject Fundamentals of Freedom, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE YOUNG MAN'S MENTAL AND PHYSICAL APPROACH TO WAR—ADDRESS BY JAMES G. CONZELMAN

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by James G. Conzelman at the commencement exercises of the University of Dayton, May 10, 1942, on the subject The Young Man's Mental and Physical Approach to War, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN F. D. R. CELEBRATION—ARTICLE BY HERB GRAFFIS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Herb Graffis, of the Chicago Times, entitled "An F. D. R. Celebration," which appears in the Appendix.]

FREIGHT-RATE DISCRIMINATIONS—EDITORIAL FROM LABOR RECORD

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Labor Record, of New Orleans, La., of the issue of May 1942, relative to handicaps imposed on the South by the freight-rate structure, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANDREW JACKSON HIGGINS—EDITORIAL FROM THE LABOR RECORD

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "At the Citizen's Banquet," published in the Labor Record of New Orleans, La., of the issue of May 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AUSTIN. I submit a conference report to accompany Senate bill 2025, the pay and allowances bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That, for the purpose of computing the annual pay of the commissioned officers of the Regular Army and Marine Corps below

the grade of brigadier general; of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey below the grade of rear admiral; and of the Public Health Service below the grade of assistant to the Surgeon General, pay periods are prescribed, and the base pay for each is fixed as follows:

"The first period, \$1,800; the second period, \$2,000; the third period, \$2,400; the fourth period, \$3,000; the fifth period, \$3,500; and the sixth period, \$4,000.

"The pay of the sixth period shall be paid to colonels of the Army, captains of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade; to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, and lieutenant commanders of the line and Engineer Corps of the Coast Guard, who have completed thirty years' service; and to the Chief of Chaplains of the Army when not holding rank above that of colonel.

"The pay of the fifth period shall be paid to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the sixth period; and to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed twenty-three years' service.

"The pay of the fourth period shall be paid to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fifth period; to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed seventeen years' service.

"The pay of the third period shall be paid to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fourth period; to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed ten years' service.

"The pay of the second period shall be paid to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the third period; and to second lieutenants of the Army, ensigns of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed five years' service; and to contract surgeons serving full time.

"The pay of the first period shall be paid to all other officers whose pay is provided for in this section.

"Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act temporarily appointed to higher grades or ranks shall, for the purposes of this Act, be considered officers of such grades or ranks while holding such temporary appointments.

"Every officer paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his period for each three years of service up to thirty years.

"For officers appointed on and after July 1, 1922, no service shall be counted for purposes of pay except active commissioned service under a Federal appointment and commissioned service in the National Guard when called out by order of the President and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the Act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, Seventy-seventh Congress). For officers in the service on June 30, 1922, there shall be included in the computation all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time; and also 75 per centum of all other periods of time during which they have held commissions as officers of the Organized Militia between January 21, 1903, and July 1, 1916, or of the National Guard, the Naval Militia, or the National Naval Volunteers since June 3, 1916, shall be included in the computation. Longevity pay for officers

in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services which is authorized to be counted for longevity pay purposes under the provisions of this Act or as may otherwise be provided by law.

"The provisions of this Act shall apply equally to those persons serving, not as commissioned officers in the Army or in the other services mentioned in the title of this Act, but whose pay under existing law is an amount equivalent to that of a commissioned officer of one of the above grades, those receiving the pay of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant, being classified as in the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively.

"Sec. 2. The base pay of any enlisted man, warrant officer, or nurse (female) in the military or naval forces of the United States shall be increased by 20 per centum and the base pay of any commissioned officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be increased by 10 per centum for any period of service while on sea duty as such duty may be defined by the head of the Department concerned, or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, which increases in pay shall be in addition to pay and allowances otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That the per centum increases herein authorized shall be included in computing increases in pay for aviation and submarine duty: *Provided further*, That this section shall be effective from December 7, 1941, and shall cease to be in effect twelve months after the termination of the present war is proclaimed by the President.

"Sec. 3. When officers of the National Guard or of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including Reserve officers, are authorized by law to receive Federal pay, those serving in grades corresponding to those of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant of the Army shall receive the pay of the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively, unless entitled to the pay of a higher period under the provisions of section 14 of this Act. Such officers whenever entitled to Federal pay, except armory drill and administrative function pay, shall receive as longevity pay, in addition to base pay, an increase thereof at the per centum and time rates up to thirty years provided in section 1 of this Act. In computing the increase of pay for each period of three years' service, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, National Guard of the United States, or in the Officers Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, when confirmed in grade and qualified for all general service.

"Members of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act who shall become entitled to Federal pay for a continuous period of less than one month at the rates fixed for the regular services shall receive such pay for each day of such period, and the thirty-first day of a calendar month shall not be excluded from the computation.

"Payments authorized under the provisions of the preceding paragraph may include the entire amount lawfully accruing to such persons as pay, allowances, and mileage on account of such service, and, including pay and mileage for their return home, may be paid

to them during said period and prior to their departure from the camp or other place at which such service is performed.

"Sec. 4. The term 'dependent' as used in the succeeding sections of this Act shall include at all times and in all places a lawful wife and unmarried children under twenty-one years of age. It shall also include the father or mother of the person concerned provided he or she is in fact dependent on such person for his or her chief support: *Provided*, That the term 'children' shall be held to include stepchildren and adopted children when such stepchildren or adopted children are in fact dependent upon the person claiming dependency allowance.

"Sec. 5. Each commissioned officer on the active list, or on active duty, below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, shall be entitled at all times, in addition to his pay, to a money allowance for subsistence. The value of one subsistence allowance is hereby fixed at 70 cents per day. To each officer of any of the said services receiving the base pay of the first, second, third, or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to two subsistence allowances, and to each officer receiving the base pay of the fourth or fifth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to three subsistence allowances: *Provided*, That an officer with no dependents shall receive one subsistence allowance in lieu of the above allowances.

"Sec. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each commissioned officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, while either on active duty or entitled to active-duty pay shall be entitled at all times to a money allowance for rental of quarters.

"To an officer having a dependent, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be \$60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of this allowance shall be \$75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of this allowance shall be \$90 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of this allowance shall be \$105 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be \$120 per month.

"To an officer having no dependents, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be \$45 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of said allowance shall be \$60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of said allowance shall be \$75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of said allowance shall be \$90 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of said allowance shall be \$105 per month.

"No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field or sea duty, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is assigned quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not adequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any: *Provided*, That an officer although furnished with quarters shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

"Regulations in execution of the provisions of this section shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable, in his judg-

ment, be uniform for all of the services concerned, including adjunct forces thereof.

"Sec. 7. The annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall be \$6,000; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army or the Marine Corps and of a rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall be \$8,000. Every such officer shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters authorized in sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period.

"Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of vice admiral, officers of the Army serving in the grade of lieutenant general, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this Act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of \$500 per year. Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of admiral or as Chief of Naval Operations, officers of the Army serving in the grade of general or as Chief of Staff of the Army, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this Act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of \$2,200 per year.

"Sec. 8. Warrant officers (junior grade) of the Army except first mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service, and warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive the base pay of the first period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"First mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive base pay at the rate of \$1,950 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"Chief warrant officers of the Army except masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, and commissioned warrant officers with less than ten years of commissioned service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive base pay at the rate of \$2,100 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the second period: *Provided*, That a commissioned warrant officer or chief warrant officer promoted from the grade of warrant officer or warrant officer (junior grade) shall suffer no reduction of pay by reason of such promotion: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the authority of the Secretary of War to designate permanent or temporary chief warrant officers of the Army to receive the base pay and allowances of the third and fourth pay periods as provided in section 3 of the Act approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, Seventy-seventh Congress).

"Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard with creditable records on the active list, after ten years of commissioned service, and masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, shall receive the base pay of the third period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled

to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the third period.

"Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with creditable records on the active list, after twenty years of commissioned service, shall receive the base pay of the fourth period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the fourth period.

"Every person paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his period for each three years of service, not exceeding thirty years. Such service shall be: active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That commissioned warrant officers shall be credited only with all commissioned service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act including commissioned service in the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard.

"When the total pay and allowances authorized by this section for any person shall exceed the rate of \$458.33 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such person is entitled shall be reduced by the amount above \$458.33.

"Sec. 9. The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, \$138; enlisted men of the second grade, \$114; enlisted men of the third grade, \$96; enlisted men of the fourth grade, \$78; enlisted men of the fifth grade, \$66; enlisted men of the sixth grade, \$52; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, \$46. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of \$126.

"For purposes of pay enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard shall be distributed in the several pay grades by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively.

"Every enlisted man paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his grade for each three years of service up to thirty years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

"Sec. 10. To each enlisted man not furnished quarters or rations in kind there shall be granted, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, an allowance for quarters and subsistence, the value of which shall depend on the conditions under which the duty of the man is being performed, and shall not exceed \$5 per day: *Provided*, That payments of allowances for quarters and subsistence may be made in advance to enlisted men under such regulations as the President may prescribe. These regulations shall be uniform for all the services mentioned in the title of this Act. Subsistence for pilots shall be paid in accordance with existing regulations, and rations for enlisted men may be commuted as now authorized by law.

"Each enlisted man of the first, second, or third grade, in the active military, naval, or Coast Guard service of the United States having a dependent as defined in section 4

of this Act, shall, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, be entitled to receive, for any period during which public quarters are not provided and available for his dependent, the monthly allowance for quarters authorized by law to be granted to each enlisted man not furnished quarters in kind: *Provided*, That such enlisted man shall continue to be entitled to this allowance although receiving the allowance provided in the first paragraph of this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him.

"Enlisted men entitled to receive allowances for quarters or subsistence, shall continue, while their permanent stations remain unchanged, to receive such allowances while sick in hospital or absent from their permanent-duty stations in a pay status: *Provided*, That allowances for subsistence shall not accrue to such an enlisted man while he is in fact being subsisted at Government expense.

"An enlistment allowance equal to \$50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge, and an enlistment allowance of \$25, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the other grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not affect the provisions of the Act approved August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, Seventy-seventh Congress): *Provided further*, That during the present war and for six months thereafter the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, Seventy-seventh Congress), are hereby suspended.

"Hereafter the President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them.

"Sec. 11. The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts shall be fixed by the Secretary of War and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army.

"The rates of pay of enlisted men of the insular force of the Navy shall be one-half the rates of pay prescribed for enlisted men of the Navy in corresponding grades.

"Sec. 12. Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling under competent orders without troops shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this Act, but in cases when orders are given for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, as determined by the head of the executive department concerned, he may, in his discretion, direct that actual and necessary expenses only be allowed. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under

orders in Alaska and outside the limits of the United States in North America.

"Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no officer of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be allowed or paid any sum in excess of expenses actually incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty away from his designated post of duty, nor any sum for such expenses actually incurred in excess of \$7 per day. The heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding \$6, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty: *Provided*, That for travel by air under competent orders on duty without troops, under regulations to be prescribed respectively by the heads of the departments concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Nurse Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, and of the legally constituted Reserves of said services while on active duty, and of the National Guard while in Federal service, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary traveling expenses not to exceed \$8 per day, or, in lieu thereof, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed \$6 per day.

"Travel by personnel of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard while on active duty in the Federal service, on commercial aircraft, domestic or foreign, including travel between airports and centers of population or posts of duty when incidental to travel on commercial aircraft, shall be allowed at public expense when authorized or approved by competent authority, and transportation requests for such travel may be issued upon such authorizations. Such expense shall be allowed without regard to comparative costs of transportation by aircraft with other modes of transportation.

"Individuals belonging to any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the National Guard and the Reserves of such services, traveling under competent orders which entitle them to transportation or transportation and subsistence as distinguished from mileage, who, under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, travel by privately owned conveyance shall be entitled, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, to a money allowance at the rate of 3 cents per mile for the same distance: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any person entitled to traveling expenses under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926.

"When any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man above the fourth grade, having dependents as defined in section 4 hereof, is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States shall furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for the transportation of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to his new station for such dependents: *Provided*, That for persons in the naval service the term 'permanent station' as used in this section shall be interpreted to mean a shore station or the home yard or home port of the vessel to which the person concerned may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of station: *Provided further*, That if the cost of such transportation exceeds that for transportation from the old to the new station, the excess cost shall be paid to the United States by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned:

Provided further, That transportation supplied the dependents of such officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man, to or from stations beyond the continental limits of the United States, shall not be other than by Government transport, if such transportation is available as may be determined by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That the personnel of all the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall have the benefit of all existing laws applying to the Army and Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects: *And Provided further*, That in lieu of transportation in kind authorized by this section for dependents, the President may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of the travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished when such travel shall have been completed.

"The words 'permanent change of station' as used in this section shall include the change from home to first station and from last station to home when ordered to active duty other than training duty, of any officer, warrant officer, nurse, or enlisted man of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including retired personnel and members of the Reserve components thereof, in a grade for which the transportation of dependents is authorized at Government expense, and the change from last station to home in connection with retirement, relief from active duty, or transfer to a reserve component.

"Personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act performing travel on Government-owned vessels for which no transportation fare is charged shall be entitled only to reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred.

"The head of the department concerned may determine what shall constitute a travel status and travel without troops within the meaning of the laws governing the payment of mileage or other travel expenses.

"Sec. 13. The annual base pay of female nurses of the Army and Navy shall be as follows: During the first three years of service, \$1,080; from the beginning of the fourth year of service until the completion of the sixth year of service, \$1,260; from the beginning of the seventh year of service until the completion of the ninth year of service, \$1,440; from the beginning of the tenth year of service until the completion of the twelfth year of service, \$1,620; from the beginning of the thirteenth year of service, \$1,800.

"Superintendents of the Nurse Corps shall receive pay at the rate of \$2,500 a year, assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors at the rate of \$1,500 a year, and chief nurses at the rate of \$600 a year, in addition to their base pay as nurses. Nurses shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"The annual pay of a retired member of the Army Nurse Corps or the Navy Nurse Corps retired for other than physical disability shall be 3 per centum of the total annual active duty pay which she is receiving at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of complete years of service rendered prior to retirement, but not exceeding 75 per centum of such annual active-duty pay: *Provided*, That in computing the period of service for retired pay a fractional year of six months or more shall be considered a full year: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of computing eligibility for retirement and retired pay, there shall be credited active service in the Army Nurse Corps and in the Navy Nurse Corps, active service as contract nurse prior to

February 2, 1901, and service as a Reserve nurse on active duty since February 2, 1901.

"Sec. 14. Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, when on active duty in the service of the United States, shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service.

"Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard, when in the Federal service or when participating in exercises or performing the duties provided for by sections 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, shall receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army.

"Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, officers of the National Guard, other than general officers, and warrant officers and enlisted men of the National Guard, shall receive compensation at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly pay authorized for such persons when in the Federal service, for each regular drill, period of appropriate duty, or other equivalent period of training, authorized by the Secretary of War, at which they shall have been engaged for the entire prescribed period of time: *Provided*, That such pay shall be in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers. General officers of the National Guard shall receive \$500 a year in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers, for satisfactory performance of their appropriate duties. In addition to pay herein provided, officers of the National Guard commanding organizations less than a brigade and having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, receive not more than \$240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are on active duty in the Federal service.

"Sec. 15. On and after the effective date of this Act, retired officers, warrant officers, nurses, enlisted men, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall have their retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided in this Act, which pay shall include increases for all active duty performed since retirement or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in the computation of their longevity pay and pay periods: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall operate to reduce the present pay of officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men now on the retired list or drawing retainer pay, or personnel in an equivalent status in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act. Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service and retired warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of those services, shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on such active duty and, when on active duty status, shall have the same pay and allowance rights while on leave of absence or sick as officers on the active list, and, if death occurs when on active duty status, while on leave of absence or sick, their dependents shall not thereby be deprived of the benefits provided in the Act approved December 17, 1919, as amended, and in the Act of June 4, 1920.

"In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired with pay at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum of

the active duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 per centum of said active duty pay, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retired pay. The increases shall be at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum for each year of active duty and a fractional year of six months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 per centum of the active duty pay as authorized by existing law.

"The retired pay of any officer heretofore retired under the provisions of section 24b, National Defense Act, June 3, 1916, as amended, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, shall be 75 per centum of his active-duty pay: *Provided*, That no back pay, allowances, or other emoluments shall be held to accrue for any period prior to June 1, 1942, as a result of the enactment of this paragraph.

"The retired pay of any officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 per centum of his active duty pay at the time of his retirement.

"Sec. 16. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard may receive additional compensation not less than \$1 nor more than \$5 per month, for special qualification in the use of the arm or arms which they may be required to use.

"Sec. 17. Cadets at the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall be entitled to pay at the rate of \$780 per annum, and to allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet or midshipman.

"Sec. 18. Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act and members of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard shall receive an increase of 50 per centum of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, and when in consequence of such orders they do participate in regular and frequent flights as defined by such Executive orders as have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, promulgated by the President: *Provided*, That when personnel of the National Guard are entitled to armory-drill pay, the increase of 50 per centum thereof herein provided shall be based on the entire amount of such armory-drill pay to which they shall be entitled for a calendar month or fractional part thereof, and the required aerial flights may be made at ordered drills of an air-service organization, or at other times when so authorized by the President. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned.

"Any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, not in flying-pay status, who is assigned or attached as a member of a parachute unit, including parachute-jumping schools, and for whom

parachute jumping is an essential part of his military duty and who, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, has received a rating as a parachutist or is undergoing training for such a rating shall receive, while engaged upon duty designated by the head of the department concerned as parachute duty, additional pay of the rate of \$100 per month in the case of any such officer or warrant officer, and additional pay at the rate of \$50 per month in the case of any such enlisted man.

"Sec. 19. No person, active or retired, of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, shall suffer, by reason of this Act, any reduction in any pay, allowances, or compensation to which he was entitled upon the effective date of this Act: *Provided*, however, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to deprive any enlisted man transferred to the Fleet Reserve on or prior to the date of enactment of this Act, or transferred from the Fleet Reserve to the retired list of the regular Navy for physical disability, of any benefits, including pay, allowances, or compensation, which he would be entitled to receive upon the completion of thirty years under laws in force on the date of enactment of this Act.

"The Act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 625), as amended, subsections 12 (a), (b), and (c), of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), section 18 of the Act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress), and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved August 18, 1941), and those portions of the Act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217), and of the Act of June 30, 1941 (Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress), which authorize allowances for enlisted men on the retired list, and all other laws and parts of laws which are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That Acts or parts of Acts incorporating directly, by implication, or by reference, the provisions of the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended, and not in conflict herewith, shall not be considered modified by the provisions of this Act, except that the pay, allowances, or compensation established herein shall be substituted for the pay allowances, or compensation set out in the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended.

"No back pay or allowances for any period prior to June 1, 1942, shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act.

"The provisions of this Act shall become effective as of June 1, 1942.

"Sec. 20. Beginning June 1, 1942, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall every sixty days thereafter report to the Congress the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification thereof, of each person commissioned during said period in the Army of the United States and in the Naval Establishment respectively from civilian life, who prior thereto has had no commissioned military service: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall not be required to report persons commissioned where such disclosure would in his opinion jeopardize the national interest or safety.

"Sec. 21. This Act may be cited as the 'Pay Readjustment Act of 1942.'"

And the House agree to the same.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall have no objection, under the assumption that it will be in order, after consent is granted, for me to make a motion to recommit, with instructions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such a motion will be in order.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall undertake to explain the agreement of the conferees on the pay readjustment act of 1942. It was agreed to by all the conferees on the part of the House, and by a majority of the Senate conferees.

The first section of the Senate bill contained a provision imposing a limitation of \$479.17 a month on the base pay, plus pay for length of service of officers below the grade of colonel or a corresponding grade. The House amendment eliminated such provision, and the conference agreement conforms to the action of the House.

The first section of the House amendment added a provision that the time spent at the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy, by any officer who was appointed to either of those academies after August 24, 1912, should not be counted for the purpose of computing the length of his service. Since this matter is already covered by existing laws with respect to the extent to which credit may be given for time spent at the academies, and since such laws are not repealed by Senate bill 2025, the conference agreement eliminates this provision.

Section 2 of the House amendment contained a provision authorizing the head of the Department concerned to define "sea duty" for the purpose of determining the entitlement of members of the military or naval forces to extra pay for such duty. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 3 of the Senate bill provided for allowing, in the computation of longevity pay of commissioned officers, full time for active duty under Reserve and National Guard commissions and one-half time for all other periods during which such commissions have been held. The House amendment provided for allowing full time for all periods during which such commissions have been held and included the National Guard of the United States and the Officers Reserve Corps in the list of organizations, commissioned time in which may be counted for longevity purposes.

The conference agreement adopts the House provision; that is, it allows full time for active duty under Reserve and National Guard commissions.

Section 4 of the Senate bill provided that the term "dependent" as used in the sections of the bill providing for rental and subsistence allowances should be deemed to include a mother dependent upon an officer for her chief support. The House amendment provided for including a father dependent for his chief support as well as the mother. The

conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Sections 6 and 7 of the Senate bill contained provisions imposing limitations upon the amount of allowances which might be received by officers in the grade of colonel, brigadier general, or major general, or in corresponding grades, in cases where their combined pay and allowance payments would be in excess of specified amounts. The House amendment eliminated such provisions. The conference agreement eliminates such provisions.

Section 9 of the Senate bill—this is one of the amendments in which every one has much interest—provided that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade should be \$48 a month and the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade should be \$42 a month. The House amendment provided that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade should be \$54 a month and the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade should be \$50 a month. The conference agreement provides that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade shall be \$52 a month and the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade shall be \$46 a month. The conferees on the part of each House yielded ground in order to come to an agreement on those figures.

Section 9 of the House amendment provided for giving credit, for longevity pay purposes, to enlisted men for service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 10 of the House amendment contained a provision suspending during the present war and for 6 months thereafter the provisions of all laws providing for payment of reenlistment allowances. The Senate bill did not contain such a provision.

The conference agreement provides only for a suspension of section 2. Let me digress long enough to say that this differs from the general character of the bill, thus making a temporary arrangement with respect to this subject, where the effect of the conference agreement was to make the whole bill a piece of permanent legislation. The conference agreement, as I started to say, provides only for a suspension of section 2 (providing for double enlistment allowances to enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard who reenlist during the war) of the act of August 18, 1941. The conferees deemed it inadvisable to suspend the provisions of all laws providing for reenlistment allowances, since such action would hinder the Navy in its efforts to secure reenlistments by men whose terms of enlistment expire during the war and might result in the Navy's being left at the end of the war, without adequate personnel to man the ships of the two-ocean Navy which the Congress has authorized.

The House amendment contained a new section—section 12A—providing for reimbursing service men for actual and necessary medical and hospital expenses incurred by them after their induction into the armed forces and prior to the

date of enactment of the bill. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. The conference agreement eliminates the section. The conferees deemed it inadvisable to include the section in the conference agreement because of information furnished to them by the War Department that adoption of the section would tend to promote absenteeism and was inadvisable in view of the fact that the laws with respect to the payment for medical care and treatment in private hospitals of military personnel had been liberalized by a provision in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942. This provision—a similar one to that which it is proposed to include in the War Department Military Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1943—enables the War Department to pay for medical and hospital care, not of an elective nature, which is furnished in a private hospital to a member of the Army on leave of absence, even though such leave of absence is for more than 24 hours.

I now come to another controversial matter. Section 15 of the Senate bill contained a provision giving retired officers credit in the computation of their retired pay for all periods of active duty performed by them subject to retirement. The House amendment eliminated this provision, but included one providing that nothing in the bill should be construed as authorizing any increase in pay for any retired commissioned officer. The conference agreement adopts the Senate position with a clarifying amendment and eliminates the House provision.

The Senate bill contained a paragraph providing that the retired pay of officers heretofore retired under section 24b, National Defense Act, who served in the military or naval forces prior to November 12, 1918, should hereafter be 75 percent of active-duty pay. The House amendment eliminated such paragraph. The conference agreement adopts such paragraph. It may be that many Senators will recognize this better by its colloquial name—the Jackson amendment—and 24b relates to the retirement by a board called the B board.

Section 20 relates to what is commonly referred to as the Faddis amendment, a part of which is retained and a part of which is not retained. Section 20 of the House amendment prohibited the appointment, except under circumstances where military necessity requires the use of persons already possessing special knowledge, skill, training, or experience, of any person as an officer in the Army of the United States who had not had previous military or naval experience, or who had not completed a satisfactory course of instruction at the Military or the Naval Academy, or in military science and tactics in a college having a senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit, or in an officers' candidate school. The section provided for reports to Congress by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the persons commissioned after May 1, 1942, who had no previous commissioned military service. The section also provided

for the completion, prior to commissioning, of a course of indoctrinal training of persons hereafter commissioned in the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve. The Senate bill contained no provisions similar to section 20 of the House amendment. The conference agreement retains so much of section 20 of the House amendment as requires the rendition of reports by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to commissions granted after June 1, 1942.

The House amendment added a new section to the bill providing that the legislation should cease to be in effect upon the expiration of 12 months after the termination of the present war. The Senate bill contained no provision limiting the effective period of the legislation. The conference agreement eliminates the House limitation on the effective period of the bill, thus making the proposal a permanent piece of legislation, with the single exception, if my memory is correct, to which I have called attention.

I shall now endeavor to break down the subject of controversy a little more than the statement I have made breaks it down. My understanding or interpretation of the bill as it is presented by this agreement on the subject of base pay of the seventh grade and sixth grade can be illustrated by taking the seventh grade and looking upon that alone, and taking the proposed act in the light most advantageous to the person in the seventh grade for the purpose of this examination of him. The agreement fixes the base pay at \$46. It allows for service outside the continental limits of the United States, the matter in which the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was interested, an additional 20 percent. As applied to this grade, the seventh grade, and the base pay of \$46, I compute the additional 20 percent to be \$9.20.

The bill provides for the encouragement of special skill in marksmanship by providing a prize which may be awarded to persons who qualify for it by excellence in marksmanship. The prize may be any amount, from \$1 to \$5 a month. Taken in the light most favorable to the enlisted man, that adds \$5. Thus, in exact figures, taken in this light, the bill provides for \$60.20 a month.

That is not all that should be considered. The bill also contains a provision for an allowance to the enlisted man for quarters and subsistence, provided quarters and subsistence are not furnished to him in kind. Such allowance would be not to exceed \$5 a day.

There is an allowance for clothing, provided the Government does not furnish the clothing. There is an allowance for travel at public expense on commercial and private aircraft at the rate of 3 cents a mile.

There should also be considered something which I read from a letter written by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. WALSH] whose advice was sought and followed in many cases by the Military

Affairs Committee of the Senate. The letter is dated February 18, 1942, and is printed in part 3 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate. I read only one paragraph, in order to show what further should be considered as a part of the economic surroundings or conditions of the enlisted men if the conference report should be agreed to. I should expect these provisions to obtain whether this conference report or some other should be agreed to. I quote:

Furthermore, the professional man in private life does not receive the benefits of sick leave, free medical attention for himself and family, 30 days' vacation per year, retirement privileges in case of disability or retirement provisions after a given number of years of service. And even when found unsuited and incompetent, they were given retirement pay if they have been 21 years in the service and those with less than 21 years of service are given 1 or 2 years' pay when discharged.

With respect to length of service, under the pending proposal enlisted men would be given longevity allowances of 5 percent of the base pay for each 3 years up to 30 years.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose at this time to argue about this bill. It is my purpose to give as clear an explanation as I can of the agreement. I think it is unnecessary for me to justify, or try to justify, the increases which are made throughout the bill, particularly with respect to grades 7 and 6. Those increases are quite large in percentage. On the assumption that every enlisted man whom we consider in making this calculation has been in service 4 months, he would be entitled to an increase of \$9 a month for such service. The increase provided in the conference report is \$16, that is, \$46 as against \$30. As I compute it, that is 53 and a fraction percent increase on the base pay, assuming it to be, not \$21, but \$30 a month. That is, assuming that by being in service 4 months the enlisted man has gained the advancement which comes under the existing law, so that he is now entitled to \$30 a month, the proposed agreement would increase his monthly pay at the rate of 53 and a fraction percent. The spread between \$21 and \$46 would be still greater.

In its present form the bill does not represent increases in all the changes. Some of the changes cause decreases here and there. One of the primary purposes of Congress in undertaking to enact this legislation is to handle the very complicated and difficult matter of adjustment of pay of six different branches of the military department of the Government so that there will be an equitable relation between them as nearly as possible with respect to their pay, with respect to advancement by promotion, and with respect to recognition of increased responsibility, skill, wisdom, and leadership, by appropriate graded increases in pay in the several branches of the Army and Navy.

The conferees on the part of both Houses agreed to make the legislation effective on the 1st day of June 1942.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I move to recommit the conference report with instructions to the Senate con-

ferees. First, to agree to a base pay of \$54 a month for the sixth grade and \$50 for the seventh grade, and second, to make all pay increases retroactive to June 1, 1942.

My purpose in making the motion is to preserve all the conference report upon which there has been agreement, relating to all the other sections which the Senator from Vermont has explained, and to narrow down the instructions to these two relatively simple matters of policy so that all the work of the conferees may be retained, including the so-called Jackson amendment and all the other things, thus narrowing the question down to a simple issue which, if the motion should prevail, could be agreed upon in a very few minutes.

This will be the result if my motion prevails because the House conferees are committed to \$54 for grade 6 and to \$50 for grade 7, and under my motion the Senate conferees would be under instructions to accept those rates of pay. All other matters having previously been agreed to, the conference should not take longer than it takes someone to write the provision on a piece of paper and bring it back to the respective Houses.

Furthermore, there could not be any loss to those who would be affected by the pay increases, because the instructions provide that the increases shall be made retroactive to June 1, 1942.

So, Mr. President, we come down to a simple question of whether a majority of the Senate wants to provide that enlisted personnel of the seventh grade, the lowest grade, shall receive a base pay of \$50 a month, and enlisted men of the sixth grade, the next highest grade, shall receive \$54 a month, or whether it wishes to agree to the conference report and thereby deprive those in the seventh grade of \$4 a month and those in the sixth grade of \$2 a month. Personally, this issue seems relatively simple to me. It is a matter of simple justice that we should be willing to go as far as the House of Representatives has twice gone in treating these men more generously than it is proposed to treat them by the conference report.

Let me underscore at the outset, Mr. President, that I do not believe there is any way in which Congress can compensate, in a monetary way, the young men of this Nation who go forth to fight and perhaps to die for this country; but we can, it seems to me, treat them more generously than we have treated them in the past. I think we should treat them as generously as soldiers of similar rank are being treated by any other nation on earth. Unless I am incorrectly informed, Australia pays her lowest-grade soldiers \$48 a month. Certainly this, the richest Nation on earth, can afford to offer to its men a base pay which will be as generous as that provided by the Commonwealth of Australia, which, with all due respect to her heroic defense and her heroic sons, cannot be said to be as well provided with the power to create wealth as is this great Nation of ours.

Mr. President, let me say that in view of the fact that this Congress has not, so far as I know, blinked an eye at the

authorization and the appropriation of billions upon billions of dollars, we should not have been willing to swallow the herd of appropriation camels that has gone through this Chamber since July 1, 1940, and strain at this gnat, which is to provide a small increase in pay to men who will be called upon by the thousands to die for this Nation.

In that respect, Mr. President, I think we should make a sharp distinction between those provisions in the bill to which I give my hearty accord and assent and which are designed more to take care of those who choose soldiering, or choose the Navy or Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, as a profession for life, and those provisions which affect those who are now being called in this war to go into the fighting services of this Nation and be ready to die in any number that may be required.

Mr. President, it is not appropriate to take into consideration what is offered here in the way of longevity pay, for, as I said when this matter was under debate a few days ago, unfortunately, many of these men, I fear, will never be in the service long enough to be interested in longevity pay. They will perhaps be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice before the longevity provisions in the bill could bring them any benefits.

Indeed, Mr. President, as I make a rough calculation, since July 1, 1940, the Congress has appropriated, or authorized the executive departments to enter into contracts, totaling more than \$166,000,000,000. The \$200,000,000,000 debt mark is readily in sight, and I have heard it whispered around that there is a \$45,000,000,000 additional appropriation and authorization bill cooking somewhere on the Executive stove downtown. It has taken months to consider this pay-increase bill but if the \$45,000,000,000 bill comes here, Mr. President, I do not expect to see it take the Congress 6 or 8 months to come to a conclusion as to whether by drawing their sights very fine they can shave off a little here or a little there. As a matter of fact, it will pass the House of Representatives in record-breaking time. It will come to the Senate, and here it will be augmented; it will be increased by afterthoughts of those in the executive branch between the brief time when it was introduced in the House of Representatives and when it reaches the Senate Appropriations Committee. I do not make these comparisons for any invidious purposes, but I say that a nation which through its legislative arm is willing to appropriate these huge sums of money—and I have joined in their appropriation—in record-breaking time should not, it seems to me, be overly cautious, or unreasonably parsimonious in providing compensation for the men whom we have called upon to go forth and offer the supreme sacrifice upon the altar of their country on the seven seas and on every continent of this globe.

Mr. President, my colleagues know I have fought to the best of my humble ability to prevent unconscionable profits from being accumulated in this war. I do not know that it is a logical argument, but certainly it is one that appeals to me. We have passed numerous tax

bills in contemplation of this huge defense effort and of the great enrichment which must come to the economy of this Nation as the result of the expenditure of untold billions of dollars. But efforts made to adopt drastic war-profits bills have failed. I wish to call attention in this connection to a statement taken from the United States News of May 8, 1942, with regard to corporation profits. In quoting the statement I do not feel that anyone can say that I have called upon a source of authority which is at all prejudiced against corporations. I quote from the yellow sheet of this issue called Newsgram—Tomorrow:

In the matter of taxes and of profits—

There's to be a leveling down of higher individual incomes. Not that a flat \$25,000 will be fixed on personal income, after taxes. It won't be.

But Congress inevitably will hit hard against incomes over \$10,000. There won't be many net incomes above \$25,000 during, or even after, this war.

There's also to be a drain on corporation income. It won't be a drain that wipes out profits, particularly of large corporations. But Treasury goal is to get profits after taxes back to the 1939 or 1940 level. That means big taxes.

The reason why is this—

Listen to this:

Corporations with net income earned \$6,700,000,000 in 1939, and out of that kept \$5,553,000,000 after Federal taxes. That's on a moderate business volume.

Then corporations with net income earned \$15,200,000,000 in 1941, and kept \$8,270,000,000 after Federal taxes. It was a record profit before taxes.

It's figured that corporation net income may reach \$18,500,000,000 in 1942, and under present taxes, \$10,000,000,000 would be kept. That's a lot of profit.

In other words, the profit-making powers, the vitality of United States industry, in face of rising labor and raw material costs, is very great, greater than expected.

Mr. President, in this connection I also wish to read briefly from the statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury on the evening of May 28, 1942, before a specially called meeting of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation:

Company A makes an important airplane part. This corporation is owned by one man who hired himself as its sales representative. His compensation in 1941 was \$1,656,000. By consolidating these earnings with those of the corporation, we have blocked this obvious attempt to divert profits, and we have increased the corporation's income tax by \$1,117,000.

Company B makes steel. All stock in this corporation is held by three families. Excessive salaries were paid to officers who were also stockholders. The revenue agent has recommended disallowance of \$82,000 in salaries, and the company has already agreed to a disallowance of \$58,000.

Company C makes vital equipment for airplane pilots. This corporation paid \$31,104 in rent in 1 year to the wife of the president for using property which had cost her \$45,412. A brother of the principal stockholder, without special training or ability, drew a salary of \$15,000 a year, and a son and daughter, just out of school, got \$7,500 a year each.

Company D makes tools and dies. This company is owned by two brothers and their wives. It paid dividends of \$40,000 in 1940 and \$100,000 in 1941, while salaries totaling \$128,000 were paid in 1941 to the president, his wife, and his brother.

Company E makes forgings. The stock is owned by three families. From 1938 to 1941 the salaries of employees who were stockholders and relatives of stockholders increased 523 percent. Excessive salaries for 1941 have been disallowed to the amount of \$563,000.

Company F makes equipment for airplanes. Three principal officers of this corporation took salaries of \$100,000 each, and the corporation claimed it had set aside over \$575,000 in bonuses. Salary and bonus payments totaling \$516,000 were found to be excessive. Other disallowed deductions included \$16,000 paid for watches given to employees, \$14,000 for banquets and picnics, \$4,000 for photographs taken at banquets and picnics, and \$1,900 for tickets to football games. Other important deficiencies were found in the tax return.

Company G makes a device important to aviation. This corporation is owned almost entirely by one man, his wife, and his brother. The two men increased their salaries from \$12,000 and \$15,000 in 1939 to \$72,000 and \$90,000 in 1941. The royalty rate on the patent jointly held by them was increased, with the result that with expanded sales for war purposes, the royalties paid to them increased from \$87,000 in 1939 to \$1,179,000 in 1941.

Mr. President, I cite these figures showing the enormous profits which are being made by corporations and which we are failing to recapture by taxation, as an argument in favor of our not sighting too finely when it comes to passing judgment on how generous or how parsimonious we shall be with the men whom we have called into the armed services of the United States.

As stated previously, these men are being called into the services to defend this Nation, and we are at this time arguing over whether we will give them a base pay in the seventh grade of \$50 or give them a base pay of \$46, and we are arguing over the question of whether we will give them a base pay of \$46 in the grade 6, or a base pay of \$52 in that grade as provided by the conference report.

It is important to remember that in dealing with these enlisted men we are dealing with men who are living on a very low income, so far as cash is concerned. While to those of us who draw \$10,000 a year and sit here in comparative safety, \$2 or \$4 a month may not seem to be very important, it is of vital importance to men who receive only a few dollars a month in cash to spend.

I also wish to emphasize that it is commonly said here that the enlisted personnel receive great bounties and benefits, in kind and otherwise. I do not deny that; but that advantage has been exaggerated. From the standpoint of the enlisted men, it has been twisted all out of proportion. Let me call attention to the fact that there are many things which the enlisted personnel have to provide for themselves. They are often required to pay their laundry bills. I am informed by men who have been in the service and who are now in it that it is not unusual to find that they have been required to pay from \$2 to \$2.50 a month for laundry services and an additional \$2 for cleaning their clothes.

It is also stated that if the laundry is operated on a concession basis, as many of the laundries are, the enlisted personnel have great difficulty in recovering garments which are carelessly destroyed

or damaged beyond usefulness, in which case, if they have not been issued long enough to have been worn out in the natural course of service, the enlisted personnel have to dig down into their meager pay in order to replace the garments.

They also have to pay in many instances for the insignia worn to show their designation so far as battalions and regiments are concerned. I was informed by one who was in the Air Corps that in that corps, at the time he was in the service, the personnel had to provide their own insignia out of their own pockets.

Mr. President, let me point out that, as I said before, while \$4 a month may seem like an insignificant amount to us, it amounts to \$48 a year. The sum is enough to pay for \$6,000 of insurance to an enlisted man. If he is on overseas duty, or on duty outside continental United States, where he gets his cigarettes tax-free for 6 cents a package, the \$4 a month difference over which we are arguing here, would furnish every man in overseas service two packages of cigarettes a day. Forty-eight dollars per year may not seem like much money to us, who have the privilege of snapping our fingers and sending a page to the restaurant of the Senate to buy the tobacco which we desire to use, but I say that, from the standpoint of the enlisted personnel of our armed forces, such an expenditure is an important item.

I also wish to point out—and this of course applies largely to those who are on service at home stations—that although we have reduced the railroad fare for the enlisted personnel, nevertheless many of them are stationed long distances from their homes, and if they are fortunate enough to get a furlough for a sufficiently long time to enable them to proceed home to say good-bye to their loved ones before they leave for overseas, it may in many instances take more than an entire month's pay to provide them with transportation to and from their homes.

I am informed by persons familiar with the activities of the Travelers Aid Society that in many instances that society is finding it necessary to furnish money in order to get soldiers back to their camps. This shows that they have shaved their calculations so close as to how much it will cost them to spend a week end or a day or two in the Capital City that they find they do not have a sufficient amount of money, and must fall back on the Travelers Aid Society in order to get back to their camps.

Mr. President, it has been stated here that we are providing insurance to these men at a low premium rate. I grant that, but as I stated a moment ago, \$5,000 of insurance would cost these men \$40.20 each year.

Let me remind my colleagues that although we provided the same benefits in the last war, and I think it was wise and generous that we did so, unfortunately when the men came back from their service they found themselves in such financial plight that many of them had

to give up their insurance. If my memory serves me correctly, more than three and a half million of those who were in the last war had to give up their insurance during the hardship and depression which they suffered upon their return.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was entirely natural and inevitable that such a situation should exist. We took these men, sent them overseas, and when they returned they were released with a discharge paper and \$60, a sum barely large enough to buy a man a suit of civilian clothes. In a great many instances the men found that the job they had left when they went into the Army and were sent overseas had been filled, and inevitable millions of them were forced to drop their life insurance. I think it was a disgrace to the United States that such a situation was permitted to exist.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let me emphasize that all the other provisions of the conference report can remain if my motion shall be agreed to. For example, the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] will apply to whatever base pay they draw, with 20 percent added for service outside continental United States. In voting for my motion we will not be depriving enlisted men of any of the benefits provided in the conference report as agreed upon. The issue presented by my motion narrows itself down to the question of what shall be the pay for the sixth and seventh grades of the enlisted personnel of the armed services.

Mr. President, in my judgment, we should be generous, as generous as possible, with these men. Let us not forget, as we sit here in comparative security, that we are the ones who exercised the great plenary power—the greatest power that lies in the hands of any government—to call upon these men to go forth and offer their lives in defense of this Nation. We did so unanimously, and I, for one, do not believe that a majority of the Senate will refuse to be as generous to the men in the armed services of the United States as the House of Representatives have been willing to be.

In short, Mr. President, this issue may seem somewhat insignificant to us, but let me venture the assertion that it is of vital importance to every man in the armed services of the United States, and it becomes even more important in the light of the passage of the allotment bill, which proposes to take out of the pay of enlisted men \$22 a month for every one of them who has a wife.

I cannot but believe that in the light of this situation the Senate of the United States will be willing to act favorably upon my motion, and I wish to emphasize that an agreement can be obtained in 2 minutes after the conferees reassemble, for there will be nothing in controversy except the pay for grades 6 and 7.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will yield for a moment, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks, after reading by the clerk, a telegram which I received from the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wonder if the telegram referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin is not identical with the one I have received from the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, addressed to me, and which reads:

I could not sign the conference report on the soldiers' pay bill because in conference I voted for the \$50 minimum pay. Please state my position on the floor when the committee presents the conference report to the Senate on Monday. I am away for several days on official business inspecting some camps and would likewise appreciate your reporting my absence for that reason. In view of the position which I took in conference when I voted for the \$50 minimum pay for soldiers and in further view of the fact that I have publicly stated to the press that I would stand by my position I shall naturally support by pair Senator LA FOLLETTE's motion in the Senate on Monday. Thanks and regards.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOT SPRINGS, ARK., June 6, 1942.
Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE,
Senate Office Building:

Am away several days on official business. As a member of the conference of House and Senate Military Affairs Committee today I refused to authorize the attaching of my signature to the conference report agreeing upon pay of \$46 for privates, instead of \$50 minimum. Since in a previous conference I voted for the \$50 minimum pay as passed by the House. I have just wired Senator ALBERT THOMAS to that effect advising him that I would therefore support by pair your motion in the Senate next Monday. I am now wiring Leslie Biddle to please pair me in favor of your motion which I hope will carry. Best wishes for success. Regards.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion submitted by my colleague, but I desire to say something in relation to the situation as I see it. I can agree with practically everything my colleague has said on the floor of the Senate, with respect to the pending motion. I can agree particularly that we have inadequately considered the field of taxation. We appropriate and spend with little correlation to the revenue-raising program. I can agree also that there are many economic inequalities and inequities in the whole picture in this country.

I shall vote for my colleague's motion, not because it provides adequate compensation for the services rendered by our men in the combatant forces, but rather because it has now become an issue which

relates vitally to morale. In my opinion, it were better if this issue had not been interjected into the war picture as a political matter. This issue is one which should be considered on its merits rather than as political capital. Our boys who are fighting and dying for this country must not get the idea that Congress measures their services on a money basis.

In my opinion, the monetary basis or yardstick is not the way to measure or attempt to measure the services rendered by our armed forces. They are services of incalculable worth, and we must admit at the outset that any pay scale we might establish could not serve properly to evaluate their worth. Our consideration of the pay scale should have been in terms of the actual needs of our men—not only for their expenses but for the accumulation of at least a small reserve. Now, however, the issue has become distorted and confused so that the impression has been created that the pay levels we establish are a yardstick of what the boys' services are worth. That is unfortunate because in all probability the pay increase could have been won solely on its merits without creating the false idea that these wages are in any sense a measure of the true value of the services of our fighting men.

Our boys know they are fighting to preserve America. They know what has happened to other nations which have been overrun. Slavery is the lot of those nations. Our boys know that the French, the Norwegians, the Dutch, the Poles, the Czechs, the other peoples which have been conquered, might just as well be in slave pens. Our boys also know they are gladly fulfilling the obligation every male citizen owes to his country to defend it and to preserve it, and they know that the Nation can never adequately pay them in dollars alone.

Our boys know the tremendous cost of war, and the increased cost by reason of war's changed conditions and demands. They know what a paralyzed economic condition might mean to the Nation in the post-war period. When I say our boys know that, I mean boys with whom I have talked and who have indicated that to me. They want us here to cut out "frills" and useless expenditures. It is their own folks back home, their parents and their relatives, who will have to pay this bill, who will have to pay them what they are paid, and so they ask us to use our heads, and not to lose our heads.

Our boys know that the post-war period will be filled with post-war problems and they want us now, if possible, to create antidotes which will solve those problems.

Our boys know that when this war is over there will have to be a reconversion of our wartime industry into peacetime industry. Mr. President, I was talking with one of them the other day on the train between Philadelphia and New York. He called my attention to an item which appeared in a newspaper stating that a former employee of one of the Government departments in Washington, earning some \$7,500 a year, had gone out for himself and cleaned up a half

million dollars in Government war contracts. The soldier made the suggestion: "Why do you not apply the excess profits war tax idea to the individual? In other words, why should a man ordinarily earning \$7,500 a year who because of the war now makes a half million dollars, merely pay a tax under the ordinary tax provision?" The difference between his normal income and his wartime income represents an excess profit, and should be taxed as such. It is hardly fair to apply the same tax yardstick to this individual as is applied to the man whose small fixed income has not risen in the past 3 years, though his rising taxes and living costs and his fixed contractual obligations have cut deeply into his standard of living.

Mr. President, our boys are thinking the thing through. They do not want industry paralyzed. They want us, when we apply the tax program, to create reserves for industry and labor so that when they come back there will be jobs for them. They know that the Nation will have to assume the task of looking after the wounded and the sick on such a scale as we have never known before. The Nation will have to think in terms of pensions on such a tremendous scale as was never conceived of before. The boys know that. The Nation will have to look after the widows and the orphans of those who have paid the supreme sacrifice.

When the bill went through the Senate unanimously providing for \$42 a month, there was no suggestion made of \$50 a month. It is my understanding that the basis of \$42, or an increase of 100 percent, was the result of study and conference between men who represent the armed forces and the committee and those who are thinking in the terms of the load the Government must meet through taxation; in other words, the load which must be imposed upon this people.

But now, after the House took its action, the newspapers and letters coming to our offices indicate, as was suggested by my colleague [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], that we cannot be penurious. It is now a matter of \$46 or \$50 in one grade, or \$52 or \$54 in another. This is an age in which many people are governed by their emotions.

Mr. President, arguments which have been advanced for the sum of \$50 could also be advanced for an increase to \$60, \$70, \$80, or \$100. A wonderful demagogic appeal might be made for \$100 a month. Yes; it has been suggested that Australia now pays its soldiers \$48 a month. Our wealth is probably 50 times that of Australia, and based on the wealth of the two nations an appeal might well be made that we could pay 50 times as much as Australia pays.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me read from the record, on page 132 of the hearings, a statement made by Major Smith of the United States Army. He said:

In support of this bill I might point out that, liberal as it is, it still is below the sched-

ule for privates in the Australian Army and the Canadian Army. In fact, as far back as the World War, the Australian Army paid \$45 a month to enlisted men, where our pay was \$30, with appropriate allowances by the Australian Government for family dependents.

A little further on he said:

In the Canadian Army the pay, at this time, is \$1.30 a day—roughly \$39 a month.

So I conclude that the pay in the Australian Army now is \$45 and in the Canadian Army \$39. Therefore the bill as the conferees have reported it is above the Australian pay and also above the Canadian pay.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I was making the statement that if we compared the wealth of the two nations someone, actuated possibly by political motives, might argue and a great appeal might be made to the effect that since we are 50 times richer than Australia we ought to pay our soldiers 50 times as much. But we are also the arsenal of democracy. We are also building up, as has been suggested, appropriations which may approximate \$170,000,000,000 or \$180,000,000,000, and probably an indebtedness running from between \$200,000,000,000 and \$300,000,000,000 before we are through and these boys of ours about whom we are now talking ask us not to rock the boat so that when they come back there will not be any boat. They want America to be safe, sound, and secure. They want America to be a place in which they can live, and that means that economic soundness in America must be retained.

So, Mr. President, I say a strong argument might be made for \$100 a month, or probably twice the amount that Australia pays its soldiers, or if we take the ratio of wealth existing between the two nations we might advance the amount still further.

I am taking this opportunity to express my convictions on the subject, because it will be interesting to see the approach of this body, and the attitude taken by individual Senators when the tax bill comes from the committee. I have illustrated that with one instance. We know that there are corporations which have permitted great tax-evasion crimes to be committed. They have paid out great sums of money to various corporate officers. With the Senate's indulgence I might point out that on September 29, 1941, I introduced a measure which would have automatically provided for the disclosure of agents' fees. Such legislation would have discouraged and might have prevented excessive fees. In any event it would have made it unnecessary to ferret out the facts by special committees. But we must not lose our heads in that respect. We could stop that very easily if we followed the suggestion which the man in uniform made to me that we apply the war taxes to the individual. If an individual formerly received a salary of \$50,000 a year, and by some means he now receives \$1,000,000 or more a year, the tax on his war profits should be increased. Why not? We are talking now about spending \$70,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year, and we are talking now

in generalities about raising only some \$21,000,000,000 to \$25,000,000,000 in taxes.

Mr. President, it has not yet been determined what percentage of taxable income results directly from Government contracts or war production, but I can hazard a guess that probably we will have a national income in 1942 of \$110,000,000,000. Probably 40 or 50 percent of that will result directly from war contracts, from our own spending. In other words, out of war contracts paid for by the people's money will come a large proportion of this tax.

In determining the amount of \$50 on which we are now voting—and we have done it arbitrarily—I have not heard anyone say why it should not be \$50, \$70, or \$80. The amount of \$50 was determined upon arbitrarily. If we place 8,000,000 men in the armed forces of this country—and I heard a statement made last night that we would have 4,500,000 men in service by January—we have to think realistically about how they shall be paid. Eight million men at an average of \$50 a month would equal an expenditure of \$4,000,000,000, and to sustain such men in clothing, in food, and the other necessities they will have to have, will require another \$4,000,000,000. If we spend \$70,000,000,000 a year and raise only approximately \$22,000,000,000 by taxation, we shall have to think in terms of how to finance such a procedure.

Mr. President, the finest compensation we can give to the men in the armed forces, and the one which most clearly approximates the true value of their services, is as sound an America and as sound a financial structure on their return to civilian life as we possibly can give them. They want an America to live in which is sound economically, which is sound politically, and which is sound socially. That is the truest compensation we can give them. During this war period we can give them the real compensation that counts, by building at home the morale which makes for the support they want, support at home. We must tighten our belts, cut out the frivolities of Government, and pay as much of the war cost as possible out of war income.

Mr. President, in making this last suggestion, I repeat that I have visited six different camps and talked with men in charge, I have talked with the boys in the camps, and I have friends in the service, and I can sum up what they say in these short words:

For God's sake keep America safe at home.

What would make her more unsafe than to create a paralyzed economic condition at home?

I am not indicting or impugning the sincerity of anyone, but I wish to point out that it can become increasingly simple to vote funds for reasons of political expediency. I make that statement not as a comment on the present measure, but on measures which may be presented in the future. This is no time for political expediency. This is a time for realism, and I feel very keenly that every affirmative vote for appropriation measures carries with it an obligation for an

affirmative vote on a realistic tax measure, however politically inexpedient such a vote may be.

I have talked with men in the services, and I am glad to say that while some of them have said they would welcome the proposed increase in cash, others said they would like to make sure of having a "nest egg" when they return.

All with whom I have talked have uttered the thought, "Keep America safe and sound. We want to come back to a place where we can earn a living, build a home, have a family, and live at peace." Mr. President, we cannot give them such assurance by upsetting the economic life or the economic apple cart of this Nation.

So the bill should at least make sure that the individual soldier has a right to elect whether he shall receive the money or have it deposited in bonds as a credit for him.

In this connection, if it were possible it might be interesting to have the consensus of the boys in the service as to what they think on the subject of increased pay. There may be some surprising results awaiting us back home. These boys are doing some thinking. They are taken from the best homes of America. They are ready to give their all, provided their America is still America when they come back. These men want a sound America to which to return. They want it a land of opportunities—a land where no chaotic conditions exist—economically, socially, or politically.

In my opinion, some of the best brains of America are in the services. They expect us, as trustees of great spiritual, political, and economic values, to preserve them and not measure everything by the yardstick of dollars. They want to come back to a nation that is not paralyzed by foreignisms, class or sectional hatreds, or prodigal and senseless spending.

Mr. President, we have a real job to perform here. Not only the boys in the service but the people back home are becoming very much exercised by the way we vote and appropriate money. The daily mail of every Senator is replete with letters indicating that the folks back home—the folks who have to pay—are terribly concerned with the manner in which the managers of government are running the affairs of state and the war.

Mr. President, I shall vote for my colleague's motion. Now that an impression has been created that this bill seeks to measure by wages the service of our men, it has become an issue involving morale and, of course, pay increases must be supported when they affect the morale of our men. I repeat, however, that no pay scale we can establish would properly evaluate the worth of the services of the men of the armed forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Austin	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Herring	Rosier
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Barkley	Holman	Schwartz
Bone	Hughes	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bridges	Kilgore	Smith
Brooks	La Follette	Spencer
Bulow	Langer	Stewart
Burton	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wagner
Doxey	Murdoch	Walsh
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
Gillette	Norris	White
Glass	Nye	Wiley
Guffey	O'Daniel	Willis
	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, a member of the subcommittee considering the pay bill, and also a member of the conference committee, I feel that I should at least give the Senate the benefit of the few ideas which I had when we were considering the new pay schedule.

In the committee we started with the sincere purpose of first making a fair pay schedule for the boys in the service; next, to see that the pay schedule was equitable through all the services in the military forces, including the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. We also wanted to start with fair pay for the rank of "buck private," with reasonable increases for each step up in grade, so that the pay in the various services would represent an equitable relationship and establish an incentive for each member of the armed forces to do his best. He should be compensated fairly in comparison with what members of the other services in corresponding ranks receive.

So we started with the premise that a 100-percent pay increase certainly should be fair. As the old pay was \$21 per month, \$42 would represent a 100-percent increase. Of course, I realize that privates who have been in the service for 4 months now receive \$30 a month; and after they have been in the service for a year they now receive \$40 a month. However, I start out on the basis that a 100-percent increase is provided for in the conference committee report which now is before us, because the pay used to be \$21 a month, and under the bill which passed the Senate the boys coming into the service would receive \$42 a month, which would represent a 100-percent increase.

The proposal now before us would give the boys at least a 120-percent in-

crease over what they receive under the law which is now in effect, a jump from \$21 to \$46 a month.

The point I desire to bring out at this moment is that we have a rapidly increasing Army. We have the Tank Corps, the parachute troops, and the Air Corps. The members of these services are specialists, so to speak, and the Army recognizes that fact. They do not remain privates very long; they jump quickly into the grades of private first class, corporal, sergeant, staff sergeant, technical sergeant, and master sergeant. In fact, I know of one group in the Air Corps—a group composed of enlisted personnel, noncommissioned officers and all classes except commissioned officers—whose pay checks for the month of May averaged more than \$100 per month. That was under the present law, not with the proposed increase which they would receive under the terms of the conference report which is before us today. They have been receiving on an average over \$100 per month. I think we should recognize that fact, and also the fact that this is a mechanized war. Our boys take to the work rapidly, become experts, and receive increased rank and pay.

So let us not think that we are looking merely at the pay increase for privates and privates first class, on which the conference committee is reporting today. We are not considering merely those two grades. Literally hundreds of thousands of men having noncommissioned rank would receive sizable increases under the terms of the bill as it is reported by the conference committee. Let me call to the Senate's attention the fact that a corporal's pay has heretofore been \$54. We propose to jump that to \$66, an increase of \$12. Sergeants in the Army, and men of corresponding rank in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, have been receiving \$60. We propose to give them an increase of \$18 a month. Staff sergeants, the next grade, have been receiving \$72, and we propose to jump them to \$96. We propose to increase the pay of the men in the next higher grade from \$84 to \$114. In the Navy and in the Coast Guard chief petty officers have been receiving \$99, and we propose to increase their pay to \$126. Master sergeants are to be jumped from \$126 to \$138. Those are sizable increases.

Remember that in our Army as it is today there is a greater percentage of noncommissioned officers than there was in our Army of World War days. When our armed forces now in training go to the battle front we shall find that the percentage of noncommissioned officers will be double or perhaps triple what it was in World War days, when we depended upon infantrymen to win our battles. From now on we shall depend on specialists.

I hope Members of the Senate will take those matters into consideration when they are considering their votes on the motion to send the bill back to conference with instructions.

Let us look at the matter in another way. Let us remember that last week the Senate passed a bill providing that the dependents of an enlisted man, if

he has dependents—and many of them do not—shall be given \$22 a month out of his pay. After deducting \$22 from \$46, the soldier will still receive more than the \$21 per month which he used to receive. Moreover, if we give him \$46 a month pay, the Government will also be obligated to pay \$28 a month, if the man has a wife and, as I recall, \$12 for each child. We shall reach the point at which the Federal Government will be paying the enlisted man and his dependents sizable amounts, which in many cases will total more than \$100 a month.

I believe that the folks at home—and when I say "folks," I mean the parents of enlisted men and those folks at home who do not have men in the Army—would not like to see Congress go hog-wild on this question. I think the boys in the Army are anxious not to see us go hog-wild. I feel that when I cast my vote in the conference committee in favor of the compromise between \$42 and \$50 I at least put my nose under the hog-wild gate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to recommit the conference report with instructions to the Senate conferees.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, let me say just a word. I shall not delay the Senate. I am impressed with the attitude of the American Legion relating to this matter. I think that its representative, in testifying before the committee, justified the increase and justified the status of the increase in a most rational way. I think his statement should be called to the attention of the Senate. It is very brief. It is the statement of Francis M. Sullivan, acting director, national legislative committee of the American Legion. I shall read only one paragraph of his remarks, as it appears on page 105 of the hearings. Mind you, this statement was made on November 17, 1941, when the amounts carried for these two classes were those originally agreed to by the Senate by a unanimous vote.

This is what he said:

We feel that it—

Meaning the Johnson bill—

would have a very beneficial effect on the members of the armed services, and we of the Legion urge its enactment.

Under the proposed legislation compensation would be commensurate with the responsibility of the personnel and would provide a pay parity among the various services; compensation would prove to be more attractive in holding men of character and ability. Compensation would increase progressively with experience and responsibility, and encourage a career in the services; compensation would be sufficient to enable the personnel to devote his life and attention to his duties without worry in providing for his family and dependents.

The new pay system would automatically apply in a just and equitable manner to all personnel, including those in the reserve forces while in the active service.

For these reasons, we of the Legion respectfully urge the enactment of Senate bill 2025.

That was true then; it was true when the Senate agreed to the bill as it then

stood; it is true today, in spite of all that has happened.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin to recommit the conference report with instructions to the Senate conferees.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words. It may not make any great difference whether the pay of the Army private is \$46 or \$50, and that is the question now. During the past few days it has been my privilege to talk with a number of private soldiers in the Army. All of them have said, "We are not concerned so much about whether it is \$42, \$46, or \$50; but we should like to see it settled so we shall know what it is to be."

I shall not reveal the names of those private soldiers; but they are men in whose judgment and intelligence I have the utmost confidence. I think that we should settle the matter one way or the other. The Senate unanimously passed the bill providing for \$42 a month. The House passed the bill providing for \$50. Forty-six dollars, as represented by the conference report, seems to me to be a fair compromise. I am not urging how any Senator shall vote. I am merely expressing my own opinion, in view of the conversations which I have had with many private soldiers, that we should settle the matter definitely as soon as possible so that they may know what they are to receive. In view of all the circumstances, I myself shall vote to sustain the conference report, based largely upon the conversations and the information which I have received in the last few days from private soldiers in the ranks. I am not making this statement for the purpose of influencing any vote on this question, but simply as a brief explanation of the attitude I shall assume on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin, for whom I have, as he knows, the most affectionate regard.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, at this time, when the greatest sea battle in all history is being fought, I do not know of any more concrete method of expressing our appreciation to the boys who are fighting that battle than by voting an increase in their pay. It is true the increase would be a token only of their worth, but it would be a very concrete manifestation of our appreciation of their services.

The majority leader has suggested that it might be in the interest of speed for us to accept the compromise of \$46, but if the House should refuse to accept such a compromise, as I believe it would, then we would not have saved any time in settling this question. On the contrary, if we support the motion to recommit with instructions, it is possible that the question might be settled quicker.

Mr. President, in all businesses except war, pay is in proportion to danger; the greater the jeopardy the higher the pay. That cannot be in the case of war simply because it is on too grand a scale. We cannot reward in a monetary way any soldier for his efforts. The most we can do is to give him a token or an indication

of our desire to reward him in proportion to his sacrifice. That is all, at most, that this would amount to. This increase to \$50 would merely indicate a desire on the part of Congress to reward him better so far as we are able to do so.

Mr. President, I am a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee; I happen to know that the personal feeling of every one of the members of the Senate conference committee is that the pay of the soldiers should be increased even more than the amount mentioned, and I feel that their present attitude is more the result of the parliamentary situation in which they find themselves than of their own belief. Therefore, I feel that the Senate in supporting the motion to recommit will not, in any way, be reflecting upon the members of the committee.

President Roosevelt, in one of his messages to the Congress, urged that in future wars the burden should be distributed as fairly as possible. This is just one more little effort toward a redistribution of the burden of war. War is a community effort, and, so far as is humanly possible, the burdens of war should be distributed. I believe that we have made progress in that direction; I believe we have limited considerably the profits of this war as against those made in the last war.

Now, Mr. President, let us add an increase of pay for the soldiers who fight the war, and we will thereby be taking still another step toward equalizing the burdens of this war. Almost any of the soldiers who are now fighting could earn \$50 a week if he were not in the service; therefore by increasing his pay we can to some extent reduce the economic sacrifice which he is making in order to serve his country. If we take this step, I believe it will be cheering news to the men at the front when they learn that the folks back home are thinking about them and have voted them an increase in pay. Naturally, they will appreciate that, and it will be reflected by a stimulation of that American spirit of do or die.

So, Mr. President, I should like to see this body vote to recommit the conference report with instructions to the conferees to increase the pay of the men in the armed forces.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in reference to the pending motion. Particularly I desire to refer to the situation in the Military Affairs Committee and to the situation in which the conferees who are members of the Military Affairs Committee find themselves today.

We have had before the Military Affairs Committee various measures attempting to deal, in one way or another, with soldiers' compensation. One of the bills which I favored originally would have doubled the pay of the soldiers but it would also have provided that half that pay should be held up until they were released from service, and then it was to be paid to them at the same rate as when they were in the service, until the fund was exhausted. That was intended so that when the soldiers returned home, if at that time the country was in the

throes of a depression, they would have money which they had earned coming to them for the number of months they were in the service. We were not able to secure action on that bill.

Finally, there came the pending bill, and it was the judgment of the Military Affairs Committee that \$42 a month, to start with, doubling what they are getting now, was a fair bill. While, as my colleague who sits to my right, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], says, I think probably most of the members of the Military Affairs Committee would like to see the soldiers paid even more money; yet the amount stated is what we agreed upon, and placed in the bill as reported.

It does not matter materially to the soldier whether he gets \$46 or \$50, and I believe that if anyone has the idea that \$4 more or \$4 less is going to make any difference in the morale of the American soldier he is just bothered and hot and mistaken, because the soldier's morale is all right; it is not going to be bought for \$4 and it is not going to be discouraged by the loss of \$4. I believe, however, that something should be said about the members of the conference committee, and I wish to say it.

The Senate passed the bill unanimously, and we expected our conferees to uphold as best they could the views of the Senate, and that is what they have been trying to do. They have not been attempting to ride roughshod over someone. If the conferees had come back to the Senate and said, "The other conferees wanted \$50 a month, so we just consented to it," the Senate would have had a right to criticize the conferees. Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have considered that it was the duty of a conferee to endeavor to sustain in conference the views of the Senate to the best of his ability. Therefore I do not believe there is any excuse at all for criticizing the conferees in the matter before us. Much as I should like to vote to give the boys in the service \$50 a month, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, in view of what has been said, and in view of the action of the conferees from that committee, I feel it is my duty to vote for the conference report, and that is what I intend to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brooks	Clark, Mo.
Andrews	Bulow	Connally
Austin	Burton	Davis
Bankhead	Byrd	Doxey
Barbour	Capper	Ellender
Barkley	Caraway	George
Bone	Chandler	Gillette
Brewster	Chavez	Glass
Bridges	Clark, Idaho	Guffey

Gurney	Maybank	Spencer
Hatch	Mead	Stewart
Hayden	Millikin	Thomas, Idaho
Herring	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Holman	Norris	Tobey
Hughes	Nye	Truman
Johnson, Calif.	O'Daniel	Tunnell
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Tydings
La Follette	Overton	Vandenberg
Langer	Pepper	Van Nuys
Lee	Reed	Wagner
Lucas	Rosier	Walsh
McCarran	Russell	Wheeler
McFarland	Schwartz	White
McKellar	Shipstead	Wiley
McNary	Smathers	Willis
Maloney	Smith	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that the conference report be recommitted with instructions. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOXEY (when Mr. BILBO's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TYDINGS (when Mr. RADCLIFFE's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is unavoidably detained. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BURTON (when Mr. TAFT's name was called). The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BONE (when Mr. WALLGREN's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is unavoidably detained in the western section of the United States on important public business.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY and Mr. GREEN] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] would vote "nay," and that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea." The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], are necessarily absent. I am informed that if the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] were present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is detained on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—58

Aiken	Hill	Pepper
Andrews	Holman	Rosier
Bankhead	Hughes	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brewster	Kilgore	Smathers
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Bulow	Langer	Spencer
Capper	Lee	Stewart
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tobey
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Doxey	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Murdock	White
Gillette	Murray	Wiley
Hayden	Nye	
Herring	O'Daniel	

NAYS—20

Austin	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Schwartz
Barkley	Hatch	Truman
Burton	Maloney	Tunnell
Byrd	Norris	Tydings
George	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Glass	Overton	

NOT VOTING—18

Bailey	Butler	Lodge
Ball	DanaHER	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Downey	Reynolds
Bridges	Gerry	Taft
Brown	Green	Wallgren
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Willis

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE's motion to recommit the conference report, with instructions, was agreed to.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. In view of the statement by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that he raised a question only as to one point in the conference report, and did not raise any question as to the remainder of it, but wished the remainder to be left undisturbed as reported, I should like to have the RECORD show the parliamentary status of the report of the conferees on Senate bill 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the conferees have not been discharged by the action of either House on the conference report. Therefore the motion recently agreed to by the Senate recommit the conference report and the bill to the same conferees, with instructions to the Senate conferees. As the Chair understands the instructions, they deal with specific items. The Senate conferees are instructed only with respect to the

items dealing with the seventh and sixth grades.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it true that the present parliamentary status makes it necessary to have a new agreement and a new conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so holds.

CIVILIAN WAR BENEFITS AND WAR RELIEF ACT OF 1942

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I hope I may with propriety call attention to the fact that Senators will find on their desks Senate bill 2412, which is the committee print of a bill which has been reported today to the Senate from the Committee on Education and Labor. As the Senator who reported the bill on behalf of the committee, I desired to give notice that tomorrow I expect to move that the Senate consider the bill. I think it is of public interest because it provides compensation to civilians who might sustain injury from enemy attack. It also provides Federal funds with which the duly established agencies could protect a community in case there was an attack upon it, and further the bill provides benefits for employees of the Federal Government in off-shore areas who are not now adequately provided for.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming that the District of Columbia appropriation measure is disposed of today, let me ask the Senator whether there is such emergency attaching to his bill that it could not go over until Thursday, instead of taking it up tomorrow?

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly should like to bring it up tomorrow if I can. I will state the situation. It is like being taken ill; one never knows when it is going to occur. This bill was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, by the War Department, by the Navy Department, by the Office of Civilian Defense, by the Federal Security Administrator, and by the Employees' Compensation Commission. The Army and the Navy have been extremely anxious that the matter be disposed of, because with respect to some of their employees who are detained by the enemy or injured in offshore areas they are having to provide for them out of their construction funds. Naturally they want proper provision made in the regular way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the bill been recommended by the President?

Mr. PEPPER. It has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.
Mr. McKELLAR. But not by the President?

Mr. PEPPER. All I know is that the Bureau of the Budget recommended and prepared the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The measure seems to be very important. I have read only a few paragraphs of the report, and I should like to have time to study it and the bill. I hope it will not be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. PEPPER. The reason I rose was to call the Senate's attention to the fact that copies of the committee print of the bill and the report are on Senators' desks so they would have a chance to examine them. The bill was reported to the Senate only today, but the bill and committee report will appear tomorrow in exactly the same form. I called attention to the bill so if any Senator wanted to read it and the report he would have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's interest in the measure. I do not know that it will result in serious controversy or opposition. Inasmuch as the measure was reported only today, and is a matter of some importance, a number of Senators have suggested that instead of bringing it up tomorrow it go over until Thursday. I do not know that any particular disadvantage would accrue if it were to go over until Thursday. If we dispose of the District of Columbia appropriation bill today there will be no reason for the Senate to meet tomorrow, except for the purpose of taking up the Senator's bill, and if there is no urgency about it, so that it could be taken up Thursday, I think Senators might prefer that it go over until Thursday.

Mr. PEPPER. If it were to go over until Thursday, then, so far as I am personally concerned, I should have to let it go over until next week.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I may supplement the request made by the able majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] that the bill go over until Thursday, or until next week. I have no objection to the bill so far as I know. I have not had time to read the bill, but I received a telegram from the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] saying that he will not be here until later in the week. He very much desires to be present when the bill is being considered. I am speaking now for the Senator from Ohio and expressing his hope rather than my own. It would be a very great accommodation to him if the matter not come up until Thursday, or until next week.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's situation. I sent a telegram to the Senator from Ohio last Saturday, and this morning received the following telegram from him:

Did not realize you intended to take up bill Monday.

I asked him if there would be any objection to taking the bill up today if the situation in the Senate permitted.

Cannot change plans now, but would agree to special order Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. President, I would not have asked to bring the matter up in the absence of the Senator from Ohio, because he has been very helpful to the committee in working out the bill, but he will be here tomorrow, and agreed to it being taken up tomorrow. I do not want to urge that

that be done, however. I merely took the liberty of putting the committee print on the desks of Senators, together with a committee print of the report, in order that Senators could acquaint themselves with the matter, so that if there were a session tomorrow the bill could be taken up then, if the Senate were disposed to do so.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7041, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me make a brief preliminary statement. The bill came to the Senate carrying appropriations of \$56,137,711. The Senate committee has made several deductions. Since the action of the House, new estimates were received in the amount of \$270,869. The additions made by the Senate committee result in a net increase of \$185,110. So the amount of the bill as now reported to the Senate is \$56,322,281. This is more than \$1,000,000 under the appropriations of last year, and it is under the estimates for this year by the amount of \$543,428.

The total of all the revenues received by the District of Columbia shows that the appropriations approved by the Senate committee are within the revenues by \$393,117.

Mr. President, there is no controversial matter in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "General expenses—Executive Office", on page 2, line 21, after the word "services", to strike out "\$285,245" and insert "\$289,245."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Municipal Architect's Office", on page 6, line 21, after the word "services", to strike out "\$66,880" and insert "\$70,080."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Utilities Commission", on page 7, line 15, after the word "services", to strike out "\$71,120" and insert "\$32,515."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Surveyor's Office", on page 8,

line 6, after the word "including", to strike out "\$12,700" and insert "\$6,560"; in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "two" and insert "one", and in the same line, after the word "field", to strike out "parties" and insert "party."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses", on page 13, line 21, after the word "immediately", to insert "for payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Central Garage", on page 15, line 22, after the words "total of", to strike out "\$12,375" and insert "\$17,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Free public library", on page 17, line 7, after the word "librarian", to strike out "\$456,120" and insert "\$480,358."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 12, after the word "recordings", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$57,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 1, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$46,125" and insert "\$51,625."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 4, after the word "in", to insert "Anacostia"; in the same line, after the name "Chevy Chase", to insert a comma; and in the same line, after the name "Woodridge", to strike out "\$5,760" and insert "\$7,560."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Sewers", on page 20, after line 2, to strike out:

For payment of rental of property occupied by the District of Columbia for the storage of construction materials in square 3584, for the period beginning May 1, 1942, and ending June 30, 1943, \$5,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Collection and disposal of refuse", on page 21, line 3, after the word "available", to insert "for payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Electrical Department", on page 21, line 17, after the word "items", to strike out "including not to exceed \$3,800 for the purchase (including exchange) of one non-passenger-carrying motor vehicle, \$74,340" and insert "\$70,540."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public schools", on page 23, line 10, after the word "employees", to strike out "\$221,035" and insert "\$226,975."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 15, after "(45 Stat. 998)", to strike out "\$42,700" and insert "\$44,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 21, after the word "teachers", to strike out "\$7,602,240" and insert "\$7,589,840."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 6, after the words "day schools", to strike out "\$35,045" and insert "\$38,045."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 3, to strike out:

COMMUNITY CENTER DEPARTMENT

For all expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Community Center Department, including the expense of keeping open the public-school playgrounds during the summer months, such expenses to include personal services of the director, general secretaries, and community secretaries in accordance with the act approved June 4, 1924 (43 Stat. 369); clerks and part-time employees, including janitors on account of meetings of parent-teacher associations and other activities; directors, supervisors, and other playground personnel at rates of pay to be fixed by the Board of Education, without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; special and temporary services, directors, assistants, and janitor service during the summer vacation, and in the larger yards, daily after school hours during the school term; supplies; medals; trophies; awards; lighting fixtures; and equipment, \$281,320: *Provided*, That such public-school playgrounds shall be kept open for play purposes in accordance with the schedule heretofore maintained for playgrounds while under the jurisdiction of the playground department: *Provided further*, That the activities provided for under this appropriation shall be operated under the joint control, supervision, and direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Board of Education.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Care of buildings and grounds", on page 26, line 7, after the word "building", to strike out "\$1,039,827" and insert "\$1,041,987."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous", on page 26, line 10, after the word "pupils", to strike out "\$4,300" and insert "\$4,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 12, after the word "pupils", to strike out "\$16,400" and insert "\$17,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 22, after the word "courses", to strike out "\$78,240" and insert "\$81,240."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 1, after the word "immediately", to insert "for the payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 2, to insert:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$34,190 for completely furnishing and equipping buildings and additions to buildings, contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, is continued available for the same purpose in the fiscal year 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 22, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed \$700", and in line 24, after the word "therewith", to strike out "\$4,800" and insert "\$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 10, after the word "hazards", to

strike out "\$598,350" and insert "\$595,150".

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair). The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 10, in the committee amendment, after the word "hazards", it is proposed to insert "and including \$2,000 for painting and decorating inside Brookland elementary school, Tenth and Monroe Streets Northeast", and in the same line to strike out "\$595,150" and insert in lieu thereof "\$597,150".

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter very slightly with the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator in charge of the bill. The proposed appropriation is for the purpose of painting an old school house in Brookland which has not been painted or taken care of for many years. The item is only \$2,000, and I hope it may be agreed to and go to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment, and I shall be glad to have it approved so that it may go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to the committee amendment on page 29, in line 10.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 21, to strike out:

For improvement of various municipal playgrounds and recreation centers, including erection of shelter houses, \$25,000, of which not exceeding \$1,000 shall be immediately available for the preparation of architectural and landscaping plans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "The Deaf, Dumb, and Blind", on page 32, after line 22, to strike out:

No part of the appropriations herein made for the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be used for the free instruction of pupils who dwell outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to pupils who are enrolled in the schools of the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 3, to insert:

The children of officers and men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and children of other employees of the United States stationed outside the District of Columbia shall be admitted to the public schools without payment of tuition.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Buildings and grounds", on page 34, after line 13, to insert:

The appropriation of \$45,000 for the completion of six unfinished classrooms at the Lafayette School, contained in the Sixth

Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, is made available also for furniture and equipment for those rooms.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 15, to insert:

RECREATION DEPARTMENT

For all expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act of April 29, 1942 (Public Law 534), including personal services, \$364,894.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 19, to insert:

For improvement of various municipal playgrounds and recreation centers, including erection of shelter houses, \$26,500, of which not exceeding \$1,000 shall be immediately available for the preparation of architectural and landscaping plans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Metropolitan Police—Salaries," on page 39, after line 5, to insert:

For the erection of a new precinct station house on land owned by the District of Columbia, at Forty-second Street and Benning Road NE., \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 9, after the word "For", to strike out "purchase and" and insert "purchase,"; and in line 12, after the word "condemned", to strike out "\$103,929" and insert "\$115,892, of which \$11,963 shall be available immediately for the payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Policemen and Firemen's Relief," on page 40, line 5, after the words "by law", to strike out "\$1,360,000" and insert "\$1,355,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 6, to strike out the colon and the following provisos: "Provided, That in order to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, the Treasury Department shall make a study to determine the proper proportionate contributions of the members of the participating forces and the District of Columbia, and report the results thereof to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, including necessary legislative recommendations: *Provided further*, That the Commissioners are hereby authorized to expend from this appropriation not exceeding \$5,000 for necessary expenses in carrying out these provisions, including actuarial advice."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fire Department—Miscellaneous", on page 41, line 16, after the word "immediately", to insert "for payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$2,200" and insert "\$3,000", and in line 2, after the word "automobile", to strike out "\$58,625" and insert "\$59,425."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 2, to insert:

For a new fire-engine house to be constructed on a site owned by the District of

Columbia in the vicinity of North Capitol and Crittenden Streets, including furniture and furnishings, and necessary instruments for receiving alarms, and connecting said house with fire-alarm headquarters, \$110,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Health Department", on page 42, line 11, after the word "services", to strike out "\$107,515" and insert "\$111,775."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 21, after the word "rent", to strike out "\$704,830" and insert "\$725,510."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$63,450" and insert "\$66,510."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 16, after the word "travel", to strike out "\$178,490" and insert "\$201,310."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 23, to strike out:

For completing the construction of a building for a health center in northwest Washington, \$130,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 44, to insert:

Not to exceed \$4,800 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$120,000 for beginning the construction of the Northwest Health Center, contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, is reappropriated and made available for repairs, alterations, and improvements to the Polk School Building to make it suitable for use temporarily for enlarged clinical services.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 24, to insert:

Tuberculosis Hospital: For repairs, alterations, and improvements to the Tuberculosis Hospital at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets NW., to make it suitable for use temporarily during the present emergency for the care and treatment of tuberculosis patients, \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 4, to insert:

For all expenses necessary for operation and maintenance of the Tuberculosis Hospital at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets NW., \$136,920, including not to exceed \$73,545 for personal services; not to exceed \$18,750 for necessary furniture and equipment; and not to exceed \$1,500 for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 16, after the word "labor", to strike out "\$900,827" and insert "\$908,647."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia," on page 49, line 19, after the word "available", to insert "for payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Welfare—Board of Public Welfare," on page 50, line 4, after the word "service", to strike out "\$162,095" and insert "\$174,015."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Child Welfare", on

page 51, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$23,260" and insert "\$25,740", and in line 22, after the word "services", to strike out "\$42,505" and insert "\$43,745."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "jail", on page 52, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,250" and insert "\$1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Training School for Boys", on page 55, line 25, after the word "committed", to strike out "\$76,000" and insert "\$90,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Home for Aged and Infirm", on page 58, line 10, after the figures "\$149,640", to strike out the comma and "including a superintendent at \$4,600 per annum, to be appointed without reference to civil-service requirements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public assistance", on page 59, line 14, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "\$850,000" and insert "\$775,000, together with not to exceed \$75,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942,"; in line 20, after the word "services", to strike out "including the employment of one general superintendent of public assistance services at \$5,600 per annum, one assistant superintendent of such services at \$4,600 per annum, and one stenographer-typist (secretary) at \$2,000 per annum, to be appointed without reference to civil-service requirements, not to exceed \$35,000 may be expended for the distribution of surplus commodities and relief milk, including not to exceed \$22,040 for personal services, which shall be in addition to such services herein authorized, and not to exceed \$49,960 for personal services, which shall be in addition to such services herein authorized, to certify persons eligible for work relief and surplus commodities" and insert "and for the distribution of surplus commodities and relief milk and to certify persons eligible for work relief and surplus commodities, such sums as may be necessary may be expended, including personal services as necessary in addition to such services herein authorized,"; and on page 60, line 14, after the word "appropriation", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That all auditing, disbursing, and accounting for funds administered through the Public Assistance Division of the Board of Public Welfare, including all employees engaged in such work and records relating thereto, shall be under the supervision and control of the Auditor of the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 25, before the word "for", to strike out "\$18,000" and insert "\$24,000"; and on page 61, line 1, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$388,000" and insert "\$298,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 13, after the word "expenses", to

strike out "\$760,465" and insert "\$685,465."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 18, after "(49 Stat. 744)", to strike out "\$60,000" and insert "\$64,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 18, to strike out:

In expending appropriations contained in this act under the caption "Public assistance," not more than the following monthly amounts shall be paid therefrom: Emergency relief of residents: Single persons, not more than \$24; family of two persons, not more than \$30; and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age, not more than \$6; and not to exceed a total of \$60 to any one family. Home care for dependent children: Family of two persons, not more than \$30, and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age not more than \$6; and not to exceed a total of \$60 to any one family. Assistance against old-age want: Not more than \$30 per month shall be paid therefrom to any one person. Aid for needy blind persons: Not more than \$40 per month shall be paid therefrom to any one person.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Sponsor's contributions to Work Projects Administration," on page 62, line 21, after the figures "\$155,000," to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That should the projects herein set out be not operated by the Work Projects Administration of the District of Columbia, such amount of this appropriation as may be necessary may be expended by the Board of Public Welfare for housekeeping aides and for free lunches and milk for necessitous school children, including the purchase of food, supplies, streetcar and bus fares, rent, equipment, rental of equipment, personal services, and other necessary expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 21, to insert:

NATIONAL LIBRARY FOR THE BLIND

For aid and support of the National Library for the Blind, located at 1126 Twenty-first Street Northwest, to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation of indigent nonresident persons", on page 65, line 18, after the word "families", to strike out "\$20,000" and insert "\$17,000", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$7,100" and insert "\$7,265."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Militia", on page 66, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out "\$9,440" and insert "\$10,800"; in the same line, after the amendment above stated, to strike out the comma and the words "including compensation to the commanding general at the rate of \$3,600 per annum"; and on page 67, line 11, after the words "in all", to strike out "\$18,000" and insert "\$19,360."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital parks—Salaries public parks, District of Columbia", on page 68, in line 3, after the word "serv-

ices", to strike out "\$370,000" and insert "\$364,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Highway fund, gasoline tax and motor vehicle fees—Department of Vehicles and Traffic", on page 71, line 21, after the words "clerk hire", to strike out "\$202,300" and insert "\$208,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 15, to strike out:

MOTOR VEHICLE PARKING AGENCY

For all expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942 (Public Law 454), including personal services and printing and binding, \$16,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 21, to strike out:

RENTAL OF STORAGE SPACE

For the payment of rental of property occupied by the District of Columbia for the storage of construction materials in square 3584, for the period beginning May 1, 1942, and ending June 30, 1943, \$3,360.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Water service—Water Department," on page 89, after line 7, to strike out:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell United States securities now held for and on account of the water fund of the District of Columbia in such amounts as may be certified by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as necessary to meet deficiencies in revenues for the fiscal year 1943 in the water fund and credit the proceeds of such sale to the said water fund of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer two legislative amendments which I have been authorized by the committee to offer. I send the first amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

Section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved May 10, 1916, as amended, shall not apply from July 1 to September 15, 1942, to teachers of the public schools of the District of Columbia when employed by any of the executive departments or independent establishments of the United States Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under the law, teachers of the public-school system of the District of Columbia are employed for a 12-months period, and are prohibited from accepting employment by other branches of the Government. However, there is no such limitation upon school teachers employed in the various States, many of whom can come to Washington during the war emergency and obtain employment here. It was the unanimous belief of the committee that this prohibition should be removed at the present time. It was removed dur-

ing the World War. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, on page 32, after line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the other legislative amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, after line 24, it is proposed to insert the following:

The disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the superintendent of recreation upon requisitions previously approved by the auditor of the District of Columbia and upon such security as the Commissioners may require of said superintendent sums of money not exceeding \$500 at one time to be used for the expense of conducting its activities under the trust fund created by the act of April 29, 1942, all such expenditures to be accounted for to the accounting officers of the District of Columbia within 1 month on itemized vouchers properly approved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment is made necessary in order to carry out the provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 29, 1942, creating a new recreation board. It is a purely formal amendment, and raises no controversial issue. I hope it may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, on page 36, after line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which was not agreed to by the committee. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 47, after line 24, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

Columbia Hospital and Lying-in-asylum: For general repairs, including labor and material to be expended in the discretion and under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol, \$11,500.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is an amendment in which the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] was very much interested inasmuch as he is a member for the Senate of the board of trustees of the Columbia Hospital for Women. The Honorable Mary T. Norton, Representative from the State of New Jersey, and formerly chairman of the District of Columbia Legislative Committee of the House, is the member of the board for the House of Representatives. The House Committee on Appropriations did not see fit to approve this item because the Columbia Hospital apparently is operated principally as a private hospital. It does accept patients who probably are not able to make the payment for hospital services which might be made in other private hospitals; but, be that as it may, the House committee was not impressed with the need

at this time of authorizing public expenditures for repairs.

The Architect of the Capitol, who, under the law, has jurisdiction of the hospital, appeared before the Senate committee and justified, from the architectural point of view, the appropriation which is the subject of this amendment. It was the understanding of the committee that the Senator from Maryland would present the amendment. In his necessary absence, and at his request and at the request of Representative NORTON, after consultation with several members of the committee, I have called the matter to the attention of the Senate; and I express the willingness, if the Senate agrees to the amendment, to take this item to conference and have it worked out there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, on page 47, after line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment, I ask that a letter from Representative NORTON be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR,

Washington, D. C., June 8, 1942.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate of the United States,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: May I respectfully urge you to offer an amendment to the District Appropriation Committee to include the item of \$11,200 for care and repair of Columbia Hospital?

I regret that I did not have the opportunity to appear before the House Appropriations Committee to testify. I am a member of the board of directors of the hospital, appointed by Speaker Longworth in 1929. I believe it to be one of the best managed hospitals in the District. An annual appropriation has been provided by Congress for the care and repair of the hospital buildings and mechanical equipment under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol. Since 1934 the annual appropriation has been \$5,000. Last year the hospital paid \$14,000 for the replacement of one elevator alone. The earnings for the calendar year 1941 were \$358,282.14. Expenses for that period were \$342,946.05, leaving a balance of \$15,336.09.

Normally, the hospital finds it impossible to collect all accounts receivable. This, I believe, is true of every hospital. For 1941 it is anticipated that the hospital will probably break even. The cash balance on December 31, 1941, was about \$52,000. Anyone who has had any experience with hospital work realizes that it is absolutely necessary to preserve a working balance of an amount of money adequate to take care of the contingencies which may arise. For instance, at the present time, due to the war conditions, it is a fact that the help problem is very acute, particularly with regard to nurses. As you know, nurses are leaving hospital work for more lucrative employment. This is a very serious situation in a maternity hospital.

I am particularly interested in this hospital because it is doing a great work in the interest of women and doing it efficiently, conscientiously, and with a minimum of overhead. It is, also, the only strictly woman's hospital in the District of Columbia.

It is serving a great group of mothers who do not want to be classed as paupers. The arrangement of the hospital to fit the burden of payment, however small, to the exigencies of the case, would seem to make for better sense of responsibility and self-respect. I earnestly urge that this item be reconsidered by the Senate and that the bill be amended to include this small item for a great cause.

I believe this is no time to effect drastic economies, particularly where these economies may mean the life or death of a mother and child. It is a fact that Washington is now the center of war activities and women are coming here in such great numbers that the demands made upon Columbia Hospital are greater than at any time in its history. Therefore, it would seem the obvious duty of Congress to accept part of the tremendous responsibility confronting Columbia Hospital during the war emergency.

Thanking you for bringing this matter before the Senate, I am

Sincerely,

MARY T. NORTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has an amendment to offer for the committee.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which has been authorized by the committee and which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, in line 21, it is proposed to strike out "\$208,460" and insert "\$209,660"; and on page 71, line 21, after the figure it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the employee of the Department of Vehicles and Traffic who is charged with the immediate responsibility for, and exercises supervision over, the issuance of tags and certificates of title and the registration of motor vehicles and trailers shall hereafter be known as the Registrar of Titles and Tags, and so long as the present incumbent of the position for which a designation is hereby provided continues to hold such position it shall be classified in grade 10 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I regard this amendment as a most deserving one, and I think every Member of the Senate who is conversant with the work in the particular department will treat it in the same light. The present occupant of the position referred to has been employed there for some ten years and previous to that employment was employed elsewhere in the Government service. The amendment would provide an increase of \$1,200 a year in salary. In light of the efficient service which has been rendered and the large responsibility which is carried by this employee, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, on page 71, in line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment for which notice of the suspension of the rule has been given. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert a new section reading as follows:

SEC. 12. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3678 of the Revised Statutes, in any case in which the Senate or the House of Representatives by resolution has authorized, or hereafter authorizes, any of its committees to make an investigation relating to the activities of any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, or relating to matters within the jurisdiction of any such department or agency, and the resolution providing for such investigation, or a supplemental resolution, either authorizes such committee to request the use of personnel of any such department or agency, or contains a provision under which the head of any such department or agency is requested to detail or assign to the committee such personnel (including legal assistants, experts, and investigators) as the committee may deem necessary, the compensation of any person detailed or assigned to the committee pursuant to any such request shall be paid out of the appropriations available to the department or agency by which such person was employed at the time of such assignment or detail.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to say in fairness that the amendment is decidedly a rider on the bill. It may or may not belong on the bill; but the bill being the one appropriation bill before the Senate, and the necessity for the legislation being such, I deemed it proper to offer the amendment to the committee. I was permitted by the committee to present it to the Senate under a suspension of the rule, under notice duly given.

The history back of the amendment is that the Comptroller General very recently issued an order the effect of which is that no investigator loaned to an investigating committee of either House of Congress can be paid out of the appropriation for the Department from which such investigator was loaned, unless there was some particular significance or relationship between such department and the work which the investigator would perform for the legislative committee, or unless the work for the committee was directly in connection with the work of the department from which the investigator was loaned.

That being the ruling of the Comptroller General, it practically put a stop to some of the investigations going on at the present time. For the sake of enlightenment, let me use as an illustration a committee of which I have the privilege of being chairman; and I use it only as an illustration: A subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys has been doing work in the field and in Washington for a year and a half. It has been working with an investigator now loaned to the committee by the Department of Agriculture. The ruling of the Comptroller General is such that the work of that committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, would have to be suspended so far as the investigation might go forward with the investigator loaned to us by the Department of Agriculture.

In order to go forward with the investigation, it is quite necessary to have the

competent persons familiar with the land laws, the land rulings, the land regulations, and in all respects free and independent to make a proper investigation for my committee. I make mention of that simply to give an illustration to the Senate, for what is true with reference to the committee acting under Senate resolution 241 and having the subject of the administration of the open public domain in hand, is true with reference, I will say, to the Truman committee, for instance. In other words, the investigators loaned by the Department to the Truman committee must, under the ruling of the Comptroller General, now be withdrawn from the Truman committee. I am making that statement in the presence of the Senator from Missouri, and I feel certain it is a correct statement.

Let me say further that the Senate and House of Representatives have for a long time created investigating committees, which by authority of the legislative body creating them, have sent down to the departments and asked for investigators who have been loaned to the committees. Valuable services have been rendered by such investigators from the departments. I do not know what the Senate of the United States would do unless it were to receive information first-handedly from investigators loaned by the departments. If we do not do this, then out of the contingent fund of the Senate we must appropriate vast sums of money. It seems to me that there is greater economy to be wrought by using those who come from the departments than there would be by increasing the appropriations or allowances from the contingent fund of the Senate, and, at the same time, we obtain more efficient investigators and more efficient help.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. As a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I wish to question the Senator for a moment or two. The Senator says there will be greater economy if an investigator is paid out of the department funds than if he is paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate. I cannot agree with the Senator at all in that, because it costs just as much on one pay roll as on another.

The only objection I have to this proposal—and it seems to have been partially cured, as I read it—is that if what is proposed is to be done the Senate should know about it when the resolution of investigation or any supplemental resolution is brought up for consideration in the Senate. If it is represented that there is to be an investigation, so far as the contingent fund of the Senate is concerned, it will cost very little, but there will be a large expense entailed on the Treasury by the use of department clerks and other personnel to assist investigating committees. The Senate should know that at the time it adopts an investigatory resolution. I am the last one in the world who would in any way interfere with the use of experts to

aid investigating committees or in any way interfere with the power of the Senate and House to conduct investigations, but as I read the amendment, it is not confined to experts; it includes any kind of personnel, so that a committee could obtain clerks, stenographers and typists, and any other character of employees it needed. Such employees certainly should not be taken from the departments.

I should like to inquire of the Senator whether instead of using the word "personnel," as it appears in the resolution, it would not be well to say "experts, including legal assistants and investigators"? Does the Senator think it desirable that clerks, stenographers, and typists be taken from the departmental pay rolls in order to carry on investigations authorized by either House of Congress?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will say, in answer to the last query of the Senator, that any employee loaned by a department to an investigating committee of the Senate would, in my judgment—and I go back to my first statement—be less expensive, in the long run, than one employed by an investigating committee, because the departmental employees are under the civil-service schedule of salaries, whereas if an appropriation is made from the contingent fund of the Senate and the chairman and other members of the committee are permitted to fix the salaries, then, the salaries are whatever the chairman may make them. If an investigating committee desires to obtain an expert or a clerk or a stenographer or any other employee from a department, of course, if the department has not such employees available, it cannot loan them, but if it has such employees available, and can loan them, they come under the civil-service regulations and civil-service schedule of salaries.

Mr. HAYDEN. Without losing their status.

Mr. McCARRAN. Without losing their status.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator seems to think that would be advantageous.

Mr. McCARRAN. It would be to my way of thinking.

Mr. HAYDEN. I note that according to the amendment it must appear at the time it is adopted, that—

the resolution providing for such investigation, or a supplemental resolution, either authorizes such committee to request the use of personnel of any such department or agency, or contains a provision under which the head of any such department or agency is requested to detail or assign to the committee such personnel (including legal assistants, experts, and investigators) as the committee may deem necessary.

Mr. McCARRAN. That gives notice that the body authorizing the investigation or setting up the committee, to the Senate, for instance, that the committee when set up will ask for and receive, if possible, assistance from the departments downtown.

Mr. HAYDEN. But it does not advise either the Senate or the House as to the extent of that assistance; that is, whether

it shall be one, two, or three experts or four or five or a dozen clerks.

Mr. McCARRAN. And neither, if the resolution were referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, would the Senate know when the resolution was adopted how many clerks would be necessary or how long the investigation would last.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would be the duty of the committee to inquire as to how many clerks would be employed, because upon such information would depend the amount of money to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. In the long run all the money comes from the Treasury anyway, and my theory is—and I suggest it to the Senator—that if we use the regular civil service employees we will curtail the expense materially.

Mr. HAYDEN. There were at one time over 200 departmental employees engaged in various House and Senate investigations. Naturally the departments complain that if their employees are taken away from them then they cannot perform the work for which Congress has appropriated money, and so they come back to the Appropriations Committee for deficiencies and say, "So many of our employees have been taken away that we cannot do the work the law requires, and, therefore, you must give us more money in order that we may obtain clerks."

Mr. McCARRAN. After all it comes through Congress, and if we provide for it in the least expensive way that is better to my way of thinking.

Mr. HAYDEN. One other point I wish to make. There have also been instances after a committee of investigation was established of persons having been placed upon a departmental pay roll for the sole purpose of detailing them to the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot answer as to that; I do not know anything about it.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is why I should like to offer a suggestion about an amendment to the amendment. As it reads now, toward the end the amendment provides that—

the compensation of any person detailed or assigned to the committee pursuant to any such request shall be paid out of the appropriations available to the department or agency by which such person was employed at the time of such assignment or detail.

Any such person certainly ought to have been employed by the department prior to the time of the investigation. Would the Senator object to amending the amendment by striking out the word "at", in line 11, and inserting the words "prior to", and then striking out the words "such assignment or detail" and inserting the words "passage of such resolution", so that it would read:

available to the department or agency by which such person was employed prior to the time of the passage of such resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator's suggestion is a good one, and I should be glad to accept it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer that as an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief observation, growing out of quite a long experience with one investigating committee of the Senate. If committees are denied the right, after it has been expressly given in the resolution authorizing the original investigation, to have the loan of persons from the executive departments, the inevitable result is that the committee must pay more money or get inferior personnel, for the simple reason that anyone coming into the employ of an investigating committee knows that the activity is bound to be of limited duration. In other words, it is part-time employment, so to speak, and does not have continuity, whereas persons who are on loan from the executive branch of the Government know that they are not losing their civil service status. They are annual employees. Therefore, in my observation, making possible the loan of employees from the departments will in the long run cost the Treasury of the United States less, and will provide for the various investigating committees of the Congress a higher type of personnel at a lesser outlay of money.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. With the general purpose of the Senator's amendment I am in hearty sympathy; I think something of this kind should be provided. However, it seems to me the Senator may cover a little too much territory. His amendment reads "all personnel." It seems to me it should be confined to experts, such as legal experts. To take a great many clerks from a department might seriously cripple the department, and I was wondering whether the amendment could not be limited to some extent. What does the Senator think of that?

Mr. McCARRAN. First, I should not like to have the term "expert" employed. Not many will agree on exactly what an expert is. A man may be an expert in the estimation of some, and not in the estimation of others. Secondly, it is assumed that no committee of the Senate will call for more assistants than it actually needs. We must trust each other.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is something in that.

Mr. McCARRAN. This comes back to the very matter referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. If it becomes necessary to have a clerk or typist, it seems to me getting a clerk or typist with civil-service status and drawing a civil-service salary is very much less expensive than getting one at a higher salary. This is hardly a time

when it is possible to employ a typist or stenographer outside the civil service at less than \$1,800 a year, whereas many of the Government typists are working for \$1,440 or \$1,680 a year.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to add my voice to that of the Senator from Wisconsin in stating that it is almost impossible to get the necessary personnel in order to make a proper investigation if we have to go outside and engage them, for the simple reason that at this time personnel of the right type are scarce, and they much prefer to be on a permanent pay roll, if they can get on one. We have been extremely careful about the uses we have made of those we have had from the various departments in Washington. We have used them as little as possible. But it will be a very serious handicap to the committee of which I happen to be chairman if the ruling of the Comptroller General is allowed to stand, unless the Senate is in a frame of mind to furnish the necessary funds to continue the investigations on which we are now at work.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me to ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand from the Senator from Missouri that at this time the departments are prohibiting him from using any of the so-called experts who have been heretofore attached to his committee for investigation purposes?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is the situation. I have had notice from the Comptroller General that he would not pay them after a certain date.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Comptroller General takes that position, it means, if I understand it correctly, that unless we amend the law in some way, all clerks, experts, or whatever they may be called, who have been heretofore loaned to the various committees of the Senate, will be denied the right to participate, at the request of any committee, in any of such proceedings hereafter.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator is correct, and we will have to employ others.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the amendment of the Senator from Nevada attempt to cure that situation which now exists?

Mr. McCARRAN. It attempts to give authority to the Comptroller General, so that he will not be bound by the ruling which he has sought to enforce.

Mr. TRUMAN. The ruling of the Comptroller General is based on an amendment to an appropriation bill heretofore enacted, which prohibited the use of personnel in Washington, when it was found that there were some two hundred clerks and typists employed by the various committees of both the House and the Senate. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada, as I understand, merely repeals that prohibition in a former appropriation act.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will yield for one further observation, Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Ex-

penses of the Senate I agree with the theory of the amendment, and I am satisfied that the personnel from the various departments now being discussed are much better qualified to go into the field and make a complete investigation than one whom some committee would have to employ and break in, so to speak.

In addition to that, let me state what would confront the Committee to Audit and Control in the event none of this personnel were available to the various committees of the Senate. It would merely mean that extended hearings might have to be held in order to ascertain or develop exactly the scope of the investigation to be pursued by the committee requesting the assistance, and the total amount to be used in connection with all the various employees.

While I am on this subject, Mr. President, let me repeat a statement I have made once before on the floor of the Senate, and I take this opportunity, with the consent of the Senator from Nevada, to make it once again. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is constantly confronted with resolutions reported by some committee asking the Committee to Audit and Control to authorize expenditure of money, without the semblance of a hearing or without any evidence to support the request for the authorization found in the resolution.

Our committee is in charge of the purse strings, so far as the contingent expenses of the Senate are concerned, and it is our duty to pass upon whether or not we will grant \$10,000, or \$15,000, or \$20,000, or whatever amount may be requested. We can increase or decrease the amount. In a number of cases there is not a scintilla of evidence upon which the Committee to Audit and Control can base a proper finding as to whether or not the investigating committee is entitled to any sum.

We have to speculate and guess. Once before I asked on the floor of the Senate that the committees presenting resolutions, instead of seeking to pass the responsibility to the Committee to Audit and Control, go into the question thoroughly. Evidence should be taken and a report made. That would give the Committee to Audit and Control the evidence. We would then have a basis upon which to allow the sums necessary to carry on the investigation. In other words, it does not seem to me to be fair to the Committee to Audit and Control to follow the present system, and we are at the point where the committee will be compelled to hold hearings in order to determine the necessary sum an investigating committee is entitled to in order to enable it to carry on a proper investigation.

There is at this time before the Committee to Audit and Control a resolution which the members of a standing committee involved merely O. K.'d by polling, the majority of the committee endorsing their signatures upon the resolution. No evidence of any kind has been furnished us to support that kind of a resolution. No evidence is before us to justify spending the taxpayers' money. Obviously we may be compelled to carry on a hearing

of our own before the matter is concluded, or perhaps refer the resolution back to the committee with a request that hearings be held.

A number of resolutions have come to the Committee to Audit and Control from time to time, and whatever complaint I am making, I make in what seems to me to be in the best interests of the taxpayers, who are furnishing the money to the Senate to be spent upon these various investigations. We merely ask for some enlightenment as to the reasons back of the request for the sum stated in the resolution.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for the opportunity to make this statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Since I interrupted the Senator a few moments ago, I have made an examination of the amendment more particularly. I think it will effect the purpose the Senator has in mind, and with that purpose I am in hearty accord. I think it would never do for either the Senate or the House not to be able to call on the various departments for the loan of such employees as we have been discussing, and I give the amendment my hearty approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that concludes the consideration of the amendments; but the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada makes it necessary for me to ask unanimous consent that the clerks may be authorized to renumber the sections, and that the totals may also be changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7041) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed with the amendments made by the Senate numbered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall not ask for the appointment of conferees on the part of the Senate until after the House shall have acted.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT THE FIFTY-SECOND ANNUAL REUNION OF THE UNITED CONFEDERATE VETERANS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7036, which was sent over to the Senate last week and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The bill was reported this morning without amendment. It provides authorization for the

attendance of the Marine Band at Chattanooga, Tenn., in late June, at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans, and provides for the appropriation of a sufficient amount to defray the expenses incident thereto.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, may I inquire what the calendar number of the measure is?

Mr. STEWART. The bill was reported earlier today. It is not yet on the calendar, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair). The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7036) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7036) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James O. Day, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice George T. Mitchell, term expired.

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Spencer C. Young, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York, vice Arthur G. Jaeger, term expired.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Wainwright Abbott, of Pennsylvania, and Karl deG. MacVitty, of Tennessee, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be also consuls general.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

THE ARMY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I report certain Regular Army transfers, promotions, and one new appointment. I have consulted the majority and mi-

nority leaders and I ask unanimous consent that the transfers, promotions, and appointment be immediately considered and confirmed, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ernest K. Kai, of Hawaii, to be judge of the circuit court, fifth circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Colpoys to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adrian Pool to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John H. Hoover to be vice admiral, to rank from May 25, 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander of the Caribbean Sea frontier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oscar C. Badger to be rear admiral, to rank from April 24, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 8, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles J. Pisar, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary

in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Reginald S. Kazanjian, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Lynn R. Edminster, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1943, vice Raymond B. Stevens, deceased.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Dwight H. Dexter	Edwin J. Roland
Edward W. Holtz	Peter V. Colmar
Herbert F. Walsh	George H. Bowerman

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Harold L. Wood
Arthur W. Johnson
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Douglas B. Henderson to be a lieutenant in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of April 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 25th day of May 1942:

Robert Wilcox	Julius E. Richey
Chester R. Bender	Benjamin B. Sherry
Richard R. Smith	Frederick J. Statte
Samuel G. Guill	James S. Muzzy
Paul E. Trimble	Raymond W. Blouin
Russell R. Waesche, Jr.	Fred F. Nichols
Joseph P. Martin	Theodore F. Knoll
George W. Playdon	Nelson C. McCormick
Thomas F. Epley	Frank M. McCabe

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 29th day of May 1942:

Robert D. Brodie IV	Harry F. Frazer
Robert W. Goehring	Julian J. Shingler
Harry L. Morgan	Warner K. Thompson, Jr.
John D. McCubbin	William R. Riedel
Ross P. Bullard	Orvan R. Smeder
Victor Pfeiffer	Ralph M. West
William L. Morrison	Charles E. Sharp
David W. Sinclair	Charles W. Schuh
Robert R. Russell	Lynn Parker
Charles E. Masters, Jr.	Claude G. Winstead
Robert H. Prause, Jr.	Thomas G. Byrne
James N. Schrader	

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Walden L. Ainsworth to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 2d day of December 1941.

Capt. Norman Scott to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of May 1942.

Capt. Howard H. Good to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 14th day of May 1942.

Capt. Mahlon S. Tisdale to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1942.

MARINE CORPS

Col. (temporary) Omar T. Pfeiffer to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942.

The following named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of February 1942:

Benjamin T. Owens, a citizen of Oklahoma.
Henry W. Seeley, Jr., a citizen of Connecticut.

The following named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of March 1942.

Rora T. Musselwhite, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.
William B. Allison, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Dannitte M. Beattie, a citizen of South Carolina.
Gordon S. Calder, a citizen of New York.

Charles W. Churchill, a citizen of Missouri.
Bert Davis, Jr., a citizen of Louisiana.

Alan F. Dill, a citizen of Ohio.

Theil H. Fisher, a citizen of Oklahoma.

Joseph G. Hall, a citizen of Connecticut.

Richard E. Hall, a citizen of California.

John R. Howell, a citizen of New York.

Samuel W. Kirkpatrick, a citizen of Texas.

Francis H. Bergholdt, a citizen of California.

Walter H. Cuenin, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Walter M. Goldsberry, Jr., a citizen of Indiana.

Joseph L. Harrington, a citizen of Maine.

Bertram L. Menne, Jr., a citizen of Kentucky.

Marion G. Mickelson, a citizen of Iowa.

Lyle Q. Petersen, a citizen of Wisconsin.

Robert E. Rain, Jr., a citizen of Texas.

James B. Whitfield, Jr., a citizen of Alabama.

Burtin L. Hedin, a citizen of New Jersey, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of April 1942.

John E. Semmes, Jr., a citizen of Maryland, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of May 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 8, 1942:

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Ernest K. Kai to be judge of the fifth circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John B. Colpoys to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Adrian Pool to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Don W. Pettitt, Nelson.

MISSISSIPPI

Ben H. Bacon, Schlater.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clarence W. Boshamer, Gastonia.

N. Hunt Gwyn, Lenoir.

Erma S. Lancaster, Rural Hall.

PENNSYLVANIA

Anna C. DeHart, Ivyland.

Joseph A. Zalot, Langhorne.

Bertha E. Weaver, Terre Hill.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John B. O'Neal, Fairfax.

Earle M. Wharton, Ware Shoals.

TENNESSEE

Hugh B. Milstead, Hornsby.

VIRGINIA

Henry C. Swanson, Danville.

WASHINGTON

Clinton L. Byers, Longview.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

John H. Hoover to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue during his assignment as commander of the Caribbean Sea frontier.

Oscar C. Badger to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, AND APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Jess Franklin Gamble et al., for appointment, promotion, or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, which appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, 1942, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 4893.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most holy and gracious God, the Father of mankind and the refuge of Thy children in every age, Thou dost wait to be merciful. We pray that we may adorn the teaching of our Lord by wholesome speech and quickening footsteps in the paths of duty; bless us with the promise, the enchantment, and with the prophecy of spring.

Under Thy fatherly benediction defend us from all perils and wanton adversaries and be unto all our fellow countrymen an immeasurable might, calling us by night and by day, rejoicing that the glory of freedom is deathless and the pall of tyranny is fleeting. Elected to fulfill the greatest task of any race, forbid that we should ever traffic in human misery nor wear the mantle of self-pride. We pray for growing strength and endurance to bless our workers in shop and field; Oh, let us meet them on the heights of their life and being, where all men are brothers and where the jarring notes of discord are caught up into a symphony of mutual service and understanding. For the sake of Him who ever enfolds us in His love. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 5, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that, on June 3, 1942, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6979. An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from a local paper in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an original oration by John Randolph Bibb, of Nashville, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE LATE BRIAN BELL

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned with deep regret of the sudden death this morning of Brian Bell, chief of the Washington bureau of the Associated Press.

The passing of a man like Brian Bell in a day when the world badly needs true and tried journalists even as it needs stalwart statesmen is, indeed, a grievous loss.

Mr. Bell had been with the Associated Press for many years and had been chief of the Washington bureau since January 1939. He directed the activities of that bureau during all the feverish days of the second World War. The responsibilities of that position became heavier and heavier, and his kind, stout heart broke under the strain.

I knew Mr. Bell for a good many years and I pay to him the tribute reserved for the truly great in the profession of journalism. He was a good reporter. By his faithful allegiance to the highest standards and ethics of his profession Brian Bell made an important contribution to the life of his times.

He is another victim of the war, and appropriately taps may be sounded along with "30."

LEONORA TOLAND

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 501), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Leonora Toland, widow of Edmund Toland, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount not to exceed \$250 to defray funeral expenses of the said Edmund Toland.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 502), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That on Wednesday, the 24th day of June 1942, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials, under the provisions of clause 40-A of rule XI. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until the last issue of the RECORD of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, on the life, character, and public service of the deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings the Speaker shall call the House to order and then, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, he shall declare the House adjourned; and be it further

Resolved, That the necessary expenses connected with the memorial services herein authorized shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Memorials and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON ILLEGITIMATE LABOR PRACTICES AND OUTLAWING RACKETEERING

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably (Rept. No. 2215), without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Res. 500), providing for the printing of 3,000 additional copies of the hearings held before subcommittee No. 3, of the Committee on the Judiciary, relative to injunctions against illegitimate labor practices and outlawing racketeering.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 3,000 additional copies of the hearings held before Subcommittee No. 3 of said committee on the bill (H. R. 7067) relative to injunctions against illegitimate labor practices and outlawing racketeering.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. This resolution has the approval of the entire Committee on Printing?

Mr. JARMAN. It does; yes.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON REVENUE REVISION OF 1942

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably (Rept. No. 2216), without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 67), providing for the printing of 3,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means on the bill entitled "Revenue Revision of 1942," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 3,000 additional copies of the hearings, held before said committee, on the bill entitled "Revenue Revision of 1942."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the magazine America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER NOW

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks by the insertion of a newspaper article in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Bay City (Mich.) Times of Friday, June 5, an article regarding a new synthetic rubber and an interview with Dr. Willard H. Dow, president of the great Dow Chemical Co. regarding it. That organization is now producing this product which is called thiokol. It has practically all the advantages of natural rubber and some very desirable qualities which the natural product does not possess.

I have been familiar with the development of the Dow Chemical Co. since its inception. I have watched its growth with amazement. It has been and is a most conservative and a very successful organization. It promises nothing which it cannot fulfill, and when Dr. Dow casually predicts, as he did, that the tire industry will be revolutionized by the new substitute, and that we will never go back to natural rubber after the war, it indicates the contribution this company is making to the welfare of this country at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Dow Chemical Co. has contracts with the Government to produce enough thiokol with which to retread 1,000,000 tires per month. This product is just as suitable for new tires as it is for retreads. It can increase production to any point desired and at comparatively little expense. Hundreds of millions of dollars with which to build synthetic rubber plants are not involved, as one can readily see by reading the article. If the story which follows is only one-half true, it completely destroys the theory that we must ration gasoline throughout the country in order to conserve rubber.

POST-WAR CONDITIONS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, following the World War for victory in which we are now engaged, there is no more important task before the country than the matter of post-war conditions, and I present the words of a celebrated American citizen on this point:

We know now that we can never again retire to the presumed security of peace and complacently closet ourselves from the rest of the world. We must do sentry duty for peace. Peace calls for vigilance fully as alert as the vigilance of war.

Winning the war is our first task. But even while we are fighting it, we are determined that the values we are fighting for shall not be sacrificed in the exhaustion, relief, and general let-down of the early days of peace. Our new conception of ourselves as a part of the world has led us to understand that, just as no nation can escape war after it becomes total and global, so no nation can enjoy peace until it becomes total and global. And we have, I believe, gone one step further in our thinking. We now know that to maintain world peace is not merely a task of policing the world. It is even more importantly a task of making a world in which peace can exist.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend my remarks in the RECORD and include a recent address which I made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address by Justice James F. Byrnes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the President sent to the House of Representatives a message suggesting additional authorization for appropriations for defense housing in congested industrial areas. I have asked for this time to give notice that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will conduct hearings on this subject tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in the committee room of the Committee on Agriculture.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a statement by public officials of the State of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that "necessity is the mother of invention." The truth which this statement reflects explains the fact that periods of war have in the past accounted for many great advances in the mechanical field. It seems that it is not enough that the scientists should labor in the laboratories. Their ideas and ideas fresh from the masses of the people must be tried out under conditions of actual use. The actual trials are encouraged and hastened by the needs of the people.

Presently we need rubber. We apparently have an adequate supply of natural crude rubber to supply our military needs for some time to come but the supply for civilian use is precariously small. I think we will all agree that our armed forces should be absolutely assured of an adequate supply. That can and is being accomplished by denying civilians the opportunity to use from the stock piles of new natural rubber. So far there has been no claim on the part of any responsible representative of the administrative agencies that the Government needs the tires now on private automobiles for military purposes. If they are so needed all that is necessary is to say so and the American people will gladly turn them over to the Government. So long as

privately owned tires are not needed by the military forces their use is properly a matter to be determined by their owners. The American people know well enough that if they wear out their present tires they will have to depend on their own ingenuity for new ones. Even today various substitutes are being tried out. They may not be all that we would like but the average American is going to provide himself with wooden tires, cotton tires or even run on the rim until some day one of these substitutes will prove its usability. The very necessity of the situation is the best guaranty that it will be met, and if perchance no improvement is made on existing substitutes the Army will still have all the new rubber we have. To stop the movement of private cars where gasoline is plentiful would not put a single new tire on a single Army vehicle, but it would strike at the very heart of the inventive initiative of the American people. To ration gasoline where gasoline exists in abundance would be but to deny ourselves the advantage of the self-interest of millions of motorists. So long as these motorists can get fuel for their cars they are going to try to devise some substitute for rubber, but if the bureaucrats make it impossible for these motorists to get gasoline the Nation loses their aid in solving the really serious rubber problem.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture may have until midnight tonight in which to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a statement by the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article on China.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therewith a letter addressed to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Arthur Sears Henning, which appeared recently in the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LAKE MICHIGAN FISHERMEN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] chairman of the Rules Committee. I know your Chicago folks like fish. We have been sending you just tons of fresh fish, fine whitefish and trout, from Lake Michigan and Lake Superior. This morning from the Dowagiac Daily News, of Dowagiac, Mich., I have information that the New Dealers in Michigan are following the same course that they are in Washington. No other group of planners would think of such a course.

The editorial is as follows:

It is reported from Lansing that the budget director has sprung a mighty plan for the State to go into the commercial fishing business to supply State institutions with fresh fish as an economy measure. It is needless to comment upon the starry-eyed impracticability, to use respectful language, of this idea. But it is all a part of the scenery at Lansing to set up such visionary plans to camouflage places where real results could be obtained.

They propose to go into the fish business and put out of business all of those honest, hard-working commercial fishermen who have been giving you your fish every Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. You ought to do something about it. You cannot, directly, but a letter from you to the New Dealers of Michigan might get those fellows off of the idea of putting those fishermen out of business. There are enough other people out of business in Michigan without sending the fishermen along with the others.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in connection with the pending deficiency bill having to do with W. P. A. appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two editorial paragraphs from the Keota (Iowa) Eagle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Cincinnati Times-Star of June 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include excerpts from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include part of a radio address by Dr. Yap on Pleading China's Cause.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio program of June 1, 1942, notwithstanding the fact that it is two-thirds of a page over the customary two pages, and the excess cost will be \$30.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TRAYNOR and Mr. ARENDS were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include letters written by me to Secretary Ickes and to Mr. J. J. Pelley, together with Mr. Pelley's reply.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and in one to include a short excerpt, and in the other an article about Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by the Governor of Pennsylvania on how they are trying to change the system of voluntary ration boards by substituting for them boards made up of paid Government political henchmen. I think the Members of Congress should read it. The voluntary system should be continued.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Tuesday, June 9, after the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders that may have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a commencement address I delivered last Thursday evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include certain newspaper and magazine articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL LAND BANK AND COMMISSIONER LOANS

Mr. FULMER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, for printing under the rules:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for two additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate; and agree to the same.

H. F. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.,
WALTER M. PIERCE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
J. ROLAND KINZER,

Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
CLYDE HERRING,
D. WORTH CLARK,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill and the Senate amendment both extended for 2 additional years, or from July 1, 1942, to July 1, 1944, the 3½ per centum annual interest rate on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans. The Senate amendment also provided that the same reduced interest rate should be applicable to interest on so-called purchase-money mortgages and on real estate sales contracts taken by Federal land banks which is payable on installment dates occurring after June 30, 1942, except that the rate of interest on such mortgages and contracts should be one-half of 1 per centum per annum in excess of the rate paid by borrowers on mortgage loans made through national farm loan associations. The Senate amendment also provided that in the case of such mortgages and contracts taken by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the rate of interest payable thereon should not exceed 4 per centum per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on and after July 1, 1942, and prior to July 1, 1944. There were no corresponding provisions in the House bill. The House recedes.

H. P. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.,
WALTER M. PIERCE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
J. ROLAND KINZER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, and ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed by the House some few days ago. It extends the 3½ percent interest

rate for 2 years. The Senate added an amendment which would include contract and purchase-money mortgage transactions not to exceed an interest rate of 4 percent.

The Federal land banks and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation acquire real estate in the liquidation of loans which break down. When the bank or the Corporation resells the property they acquire in this way, ordinarily the buyer does not pay the full amount of the purchase price in cash; ordinarily he makes a part payment in cash and secures the balance of the purchase price either with a purchase-money mortgage or under a real-estate sales contract. Whether the transaction will take the form of a purchase-money mortgage or a real-estate sales contract depends to a large degree upon local laws and customs.

Where a purchase-money mortgage is given, the buyer becomes the owner of the property and gives back a purchase-money mortgage to secure the unpaid balance of the purchase price. Where a real-estate sales contract is given, rather than a purchase-money mortgage, the bank or the Corporation retains title to the property, but agrees to convey title to the buyer when he has paid a specified amount upon the purchase price.

The rate of interest specified in a purchase-money mortgage or real-estate contract to be paid by the buyer upon the unpaid portion of the purchase price may be 5 percent a year or higher. The bill as amended by the Senate would provide a 4-percent rate for these real-estate purchase obligations during the period from July 1, 1942, until July 1, 1944. Under the present law there is not a reduced rate which applies to purchase-money mortgages or real-estate sales contracts held by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation or to real-estate sales contracts held by the Federal land banks, although the 3½-percent rate applies to purchase-money mortgages held by the bank. These amendments would place all of these purchase obligations on the same bases, and, in providing a 4-percent rate for them, would place them on the same basis, so far as interest rates are concerned, as are direct borrowers from the Federal land banks, who under the present law also pay a 4-percent rate.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does this amendment meet with the approval of the entire Agriculture Committee of the House?

Mr. FULMER. That is right; also, the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate are unanimously for it.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Kansas is here. I wonder if the gentleman would yield to him.

Mr. FULMER. Certainly.

Mr. HOPE. I may say that I think the amendment is very desirable. It offers the benefits of the reduced rate of interest to purchase-money mortgagors and holders of contracts of sale where lands have been purchased from the Federal land bank. It provides that the reduced rate shall not be 3½ percent but

4 percent, which is in harmony with other provisions of farm-credit legislation. Under existing law, where the loan is made directly instead of through a farm-loan association, the rate of interest is one-half of 1 percent higher than the regular rate. The conferees felt that the same distinction should be made here.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and it is not my purpose to object, but I feel that at this period of the session when we are in no hurry, when there is no emergency, the least we can do is to abide by the rules of the House, print conference reports in the RECORD, and not attempt to call them up until the following day so Members may have an opportunity to learn what is in the conference report. This conference report is just submitted, it has not been printed, and there are Members of this House, other than the conferees, who might be interested, but they do not know what the conference report contains. I think that the proper way is to follow the rules, print the conference report in the RECORD and not call it up until some succeeding day, rather than to call it up at the time the conference report is submitted. At the end of the session it would be all right to call a conference report up immediately, or it would be all right to do so if there were an emergency, but there is no emergency in connection with this legislation.

Mr. FULMER. I may state to the gentleman that this act expires on the 30th day of this month, and we are desirous of securing final passage at the earliest date possible.

Mr. COCHRAN. But that leaves 22 days.

Mr. FULMER. It will take only a few minutes to dispose of and it has the unanimous support of the conferees, both the Senate and the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. But there is somebody else in the House of Representatives besides the conferees who have an equal responsibility.

Mr. FULMER. I appreciate that.

Mr. COCHRAN. Inasmuch as the gentleman has 22 days before the law expires I think he has ample time to print the conference report in the RECORD and let it be called up tomorrow; then we would all know more about the matter and if there is anything in the conference report that is objectionable we could oppose it. That is the point I make. Not only in reference to this report but all conference reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUANCE OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 311, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation is hereby continued as an agency of the United States, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, until the Congress shall otherwise direct.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "the Congress shall otherwise direct" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1947."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same bill that was on the calendar the other day to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott], one of the objectors, did object?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Michigan stated at that time he had not had a chance to look over the report and that he would be glad to do so and report to me. The next day he came over and stated that it was perfectly all right with him and that he had no objection.

This bill was reported unanimously by the committee. This corporation will expire on the 20th of this month and is now in the midst of transactions in connection with our lend-lease operations and the war effort, as well as the farm program, and it is very necessary that we get this bill through so that the corporation can continue its splendid work.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice this has been extended to 1947. In all other cases we have extended the life of these various corporations and activities for 2 years. Why is it necessary to extend this for 5 years up to 1947? What will the extension do and what additional power does it give the Corporation?

Mr. FULMER. May I say to the gentleman that the committee talked this over and came to the conclusion that during the war emergency at least 5 years would be a proper period. The bill was introduced without any limit whatsoever, but the committee cut it down to 5 years to be sure that it would operate within the time of the war and perhaps the emergency following the war. This does not carry an appropriation of any kind and, as stated a while ago, it is very necessary to extend the life of the Corporation in connection with operations under the lend-lease bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman a question. In view of his statement to the effect this Corporation is conducting purchases for export under lend-lease, may I ask the gentleman if he has had any report submitted to him showing the extent to which the Surplus Marketing Corporation is going to go in taking food out of this country, not only for lend-lease operations but for shipment to all other parts of the world during the post-war period? In other words, is the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee

on Agriculture, and his committee making a study as to the shortage of food that may develop in this country due to the program which we are now proceeding under, namely, to remove hunger from the other parts of the world without first taking care of the situation in the United States?

Mr. FULMER. May I say to the gentleman that we have not had any reports along that line except it was stated that they are proposing in connection with the surpluses of this country to utilize some of these in connection with lend-lease operations and to look into the matter of getting any other products that they may need under the program so as to be helpful along that line.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What I am thinking about mostly right now is the enormous amount of publicity that has been given the last 10 days to the proposal of Vice President Wallace, to the proposal of Under Secretary of State Welles, Secretary Wickard, and to other proposals, along the line of those broadcast last night over the radio on the Forum of the Air conducted by Mr. Theodore Granik, wherein it is proposed to take the food of this country to all other parts of the world to the point of removing hunger from those other countries. That is a pretty big undertaking and something we have not yet been able to do in the United States, to say nothing about all the other parts of the world. I just thought I would bring that up at this time to see if the Committee on Agriculture has made or is making a study of that program which is now being prosecuted so aggressively by the post-war planners, let me say, for the lack of another name.

Mr. FULMER. That is a very important matter and I feel sure the Secretary of Agriculture, those at the head of this Corporation, and those connected with the war program will try to keep well posted. In the meantime I agree it would be well for our committee to look into the matter.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman this question: In connection with these foodstuffs that are being sent under lease-lend, as it were, does the gentleman know whether this country is going to receive any pay whatsoever for any of the foodstuffs which it is sending to all the nations of the world, as requested?

Mr. FULMER. I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I imagine he knows as much about that as I do, just what we will get out of our operations under the lend-lease program.

Mr. RICH. The committee does not know anything about it, and I do not know anything about it because I have been trying to find out whether lease-lend means that the American people are going to receive any compensation or remuneration of any kind for the things that they are giving away to these other nations, and I cannot find where we have contracts that call for repayment on the merchandise which we have shipped to these other nations, and which

we will in the future ship to these other nations.

It is a fine thing to be a good neighbor, but just remember that the American taxpayers are going to have to pay for everything that is sent out by this country. If you think it is not going to be a hardship on the American people, just remember that all those nations as long as they can come to Uncle Sam and say, "Give me this, Uncle Sam," and you pass it out, it is all right as far as the other nations are concerned, but someday the American people are going to weep when they have to pay the taxes for this administration.

The administration is paying no attention to it. They are good neighbors now, and it is a good policy, but it will be a mighty hard one on the American taxpayers, do not forget that.

Mr. FULMER. What the members of my committee are concerned about is the winning of this war at the earliest date possible.

Mr. PIERCE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he wants this paid in gold or in bonds? He has many times called the attention of the Congress to the fact that foreigners are getting these goods. Has he thought the question through? How does he want this to be paid, in gold or in goods? You have to do one or the other.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Oregon does not want us to get any pay. He says we are going to repudiate our debts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT WITH ADVANCED RANK OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2285) to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The purpose of the bill is to provide that any officer of the Navy who may be retired while serving as the commander of a fleet or a subdivision thereof in the rank of admiral or vice admiral, or who has served or shall have served 1 year or more as such commander, may, if such rank was conferred pursuant to the provisions of section 18 of the act of May 22, 1917, in the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the

Senate, when retired, be placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him while on the active list.

The purpose of the bill is to permit officers who have had the rank of admiral, in view of certain military assignments, to retire with that rank when they do retire.

Mr. MICHENER. If this bill becomes law, will it affect the retirement pay of anyone retired under this law?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am happy to say that the Navy Department has advised the committee that the enactment of this bill will not result in any increased cost to the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the retirement of certain officers of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It provides for the retirement of officers of the Navy who have had the rank of admiral or vice admiral in view of certain positions they have held.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I ask whether the officers who would get the benefit of this bill have anything to do with or pass upon this situation? What I mean is this: According to PM, on March 3, 1942, Lieutenant Commander Winchell said when he was asked about his status:

Sorry, that's a Navy secret. It's a funny feeling after all these years as a free citizen not to be able to talk, but that's the way it is now that I'm in uniform. I'm not free to say what I want now. I might get thrown in the brig. Even my radio broadcast has to be passed by a board before I go on the air.

Are these admirals who are to be retired on that board which passes on Walter's broadcasts?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This bill has reference to fighting admirals.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know, but even fighting admirals might suffer the humiliation of determining whether Walter's broadcast is all right or not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would say that no officer who comes within the purview of this law will ever have anything to do with the broadcasts of Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if this bill passes would these admirals or high Navy officials receive the same pension as if this bill did not pass?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. No pay is involved in this at all. When an officer is given a certain command he temporarily carries the rank of admiral, but on the permanent list he is not an admiral, usually a rear admiral. Therefore, if he has served in that rank for 1 year, when he retires, if the President nominates him and if the Senate confirms the nomination, he retires with the rank of admiral. However, no money is involved in this.

Mr. RICH. What advantage does this give to those officers? Why should we pass this measure?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For instance, Admiral Hart, who has just come back after a campaign, now goes on the retired list. It would apply to Admiral Hart.

It would apply to other admirals when they go on the retired list, provided two things happen, first, that the President nominates them for that rank; and second, that the Senate confirms them. This is an honor given them in recognition of their distinguished service, that is all.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that, but why should we retire anyone now when men of this type are so badly needed?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We are not retiring anyone who has not reached the retirement age unless certain conditions, such as poor health, force him to retire.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, apart from the subject but simply for the record, may I say that the gentleman is speaking about these admirals and their distinguished service. I hope that in the future we will not have admirals of the type we had up until 2 years ago, who have been saying it is impossible to sink a battleship with a bombing plane.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer of the Navy who may be retired while serving as the commander of a fleet or subdivision thereof in the rank of admiral or vice admiral, or who has served or shall have served 1 year or more as such commander, may, if such rank was conferred pursuant to the provisions of section 18 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 89; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 212), or the act of July 17, 1941 (Public Law No. 180, 77th Cong.), in the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, when retired, be placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him while on the active list: *Provided*, That no increase in retired pay shall accrue as the result of such advanced rank on the retired list: *Provided further*, That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may in his discretion extend the privilege herein granted to such officers as have heretofore been retired and who satisfy the foregoing conditions.

Sec. 2. The President is further authorized, without reference to the power conferred upon him by this act, to continue with the rank of admiral on the retired list the officer who, as commander in chief of the Asiatic Fleet, rendered conspicuous and distinguished service in operations against the enemy in the Far East from December 7, 1941, until February 14, 1942.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, beginning on line 9, strike out section 2.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, we ask that the House disagree to the committee amendment so that section 2 will appear in the bill, if it is enacted, just as it passed the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OR ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL NAVAL AIRCRAFT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2496) to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with the construction of blimps. When we had this bill before the committee there was pointed out the valuable assistance this type of lighter-than-air craft has rendered in the prosecution of the defense against submarines. The committee in the House bill struck out the word "nonrigid" and left in the bill that I have now called up "lighter than air." I am offering an amendment to correspond with the House bill, as I have been informed by the chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee that the House bill is satisfactory.

When we passed this bill in the committee and through the Senate, it was recommended that there be 72 blimps authorized in all. Up to date we have already authorized 48. These 48 blimps are in process of being built now. A great many of them are going into commission.

Under previous legislation we have appropriated \$25,000,000 for the establishment of blimp bases. These bases have practically all been established. One was established a few days ago in the Puget Sound area, one up in Massachusetts, one down in Florida, one on the North Carolina coast, two of them will probably be put on the Gulf Coast, one will probably be sandwiched in between Miami and the North Carolina base, and Admiral King, the commander in chief of the fleet, sent word to the committee by Captain Rosendahl, that he wanted the number changed from 72 to 200. So therefore the committee agreed with Admiral King, in view of the importance of blimps in connection with the submarine warfare, and I shall offer an amendment at the proper time if unanimous consent is given for consideration of the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill implements the legislation which the Congress passed within the last year, providing for the establishment of these blimp bases?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct, and I may say that the testimony is that the blimps are rendering a worth-while service in the submarine campaign. They are armed, they carry depth bombs, they cruise out over the waters, and in their cruising radius they can and have rendered outstanding service. If the commander in chief of the fleet, Admiral King, thinks we have got to have them to combat the submarines, then I, for one, am going to give them to him so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, these blimps are very valuable in the detection of submarines, provided our country has control of the air in such localities.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, they are of no value if the enemy has heavier-than-air craft in the locality.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. They would be absolutely useless in a submarine campaign in the British Isles, because there are too many land-based planes, but on our own coast line they do meet our military needs.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman how many of these blimps have been built under the act that we passed at the last session of the Congress?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, to answer the gentleman's question would disclose a certain amount of military information which we are requested not to disclose, but I can answer the question in this way. The program was for 48 and they are making very rapid progress in completing the program.

Mr. SABATH. Are any of them in use now?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes. I could state definitely the number, but suffice it to say that over a dozen are in use today.

Mr. SABATH. Is a great deal of rubber used in the construction of these blimps?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am unable to answer any question as to the material, but if there is such material used, we have got to have them and we will have to have priority for rubber if that is necessary, because these blimps, up to date, have a record of accomplishing a worth-while objective in the submarine campaign.

Mr. SABATH. So far I have not seen any favorable results. Are these the same blimps that Captain Rosendahl recommended?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. These are the blimps that Captain Rosendahl recommended and that Admiral King, the commander in chief of the fleet, has recommended.

Mr. SABATH. So Rosendahl sold them to King, I presume.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Anyhow, they are sold to the committee to the extent that they have demonstrated their effectiveness.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I desire no inside information. I simply want to say that increasingly the Navy, as well as the Army, is realizing that control of the air is necessary to the control of land or sea forces.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to acquire or construct nonrigid lighter-than-air craft, and spare parts and equipment, as may be necessary to provide and maintain the number of useful nonrigid lighter-than-air craft at a total of 72.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treas-

ury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the Senate bill, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia to S. 2496:

In lines 4 and 6, strike out the words "nonrigid."

In line 7, strike out "72" and insert in lieu thereof "200."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN MARINE CORPS OFFICERS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3152) to remove restrictions upon the service of certain officers of the Marine Corps in the Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C., which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is presented to the House by the distinguished minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], and I shall ask him to explain the bill.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply to remove, during the war emergency, and for 1 year thereafter, a restriction that prohibits any officer in the Marine Corps from serving in the city of Washington more than 4 years out of any 8. We consider that desirable legislation; but during the emergency there are certain specialists and officers engaged in the program, and it would disrupt the program to maintain this prohibition. We are proposing to suspend it, and the Marine Corps assures us that they will carry on as usual.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act of May 29, 1934 (48 Stat. 812), as amended by section 1 of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1249; 34 U. S. C. 667 (e)), is hereby further amended by deleting therefrom the second proviso.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the word "hereby", strike out "further amended by deleting therefrom the second proviso" and insert in lieu thereof "suspended for the duration of the present war and for 1 year thereafter."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to suspend restrictions during the present war and for 1 year thereafter upon the service of certain officers of the

Marine Corps in the Marine Corps headquarters, Washington, D. C."

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AWARDING OF MEDALS OF HONOR

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2456) to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is presented to the House by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Izac], and I ask that gentleman to answer the question of the acting minority leader and explain the bill.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, the reason for this bill at this time is to provide a uniform method in the awarding of medals and decorations. For distinguished service we give now only one medal, a Distinguished Service Medal. For heroism not in combat with the enemy, we give a Congressional Medal of Honor in the Navy and the Marine Corps. Then for extraordinary heroism in combat with the enemy, there are three different awards, the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Navy Cross and, third, the Silver Star. Does that explain the matter?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; that explains what the bill does. I think we ought to be careful in amending the law providing for these medals. For instance, the other day it was rumored that in a certain instance where medals of some type had been distributed, the authorities in Washington determined upon a given number, like 6 or 10 medals, to be given to those participating in the particular engagement or mission. The commanding officer at the station was so advised. Then it was a question of determining who would get those 6 or 8 medals.

Now, if that is true, there should be something done about it. Distinguished medals of honor given for heroism in war should not be determined by lottery or by number. These awards should be determined by the duties performed and the unusual conduct of the individuals honored by the awards.

Mr. IZAC. I believe whenever instances of that kind arose it was due to the fact that the medal was given by the commanding officer. He had the authority and power delegated by the President—not the Congressional Medal of Honor, for instance, but some minor medal. Of course, it was the effect of not reducing the value in case they gave it promiscuously. So I suppose they limited the number and told the commanding officer, "Now, don't be too generous with these medals." But outside of campaign medals there should be no medal given

and will not be given as far as the Navy is concerned, except in accordance with this law, if it is passed here today. We finally grouped this service into three different categories, and they have a certain function and are intended to be given only for that purpose. Of course, the determination of the value of the duty performed is up to somebody. That is usually the commanding officer. He must determine if the service was of great enough value to the country to warrant a Silver Star or the Navy Cross or the Congressional Medal of Honor. I know of no way we can have it otherwise than for somebody to have that authority.

Mr. MICHENER. Were hearings held on this bill?

Mr. IZAC. Oh, yes. The committee passed it unanimously.

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, there is nothing in this bill to include handing out a lot of medals to a lot of foreign attachés and people who do not belong to our Navy, is there?

Mr. IZAC. Oh, no. This is just for the members of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Mr. KEAN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, not for the purpose of asking any question. Today we have had several bills coming from the Committee on Naval Affairs, considered by the House. It seems to me a very appropriate occasion to make a few remarks in relation to the heroism of the United States Navy since our entry into this war.

Every American is proud of the wonderful work done by the men of the air, both in the Army and the Navy, by the men of the Navy and the men of the Army; but on this particular occasion I think we might pause to pay special tribute, in view of recent happenings, to the heroism of our men of the Navy.

I know I speak the sentiments of every Member of the House and I know I speak the sentiments of every American in sending to Pearl Harbor, to Midway Island, and other places in the Far East our congratulations not only to Admiral Nimitz, who is a great naval leader, but to every one of his officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy. Our people take great pride in their achievements and victories.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withdraw the bill for today?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I withdraw the bill, Mr. Speaker.

ADJUSTED PAY AND ALLOWANCE OF PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. THOMASON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a very sad event happened, in the loss of one of our distinguished and beloved Members, the late majority whip, Patrick Boland. Of course, the legislative duties of the House must continue. It is a regrettable incident to me, as majority leader, to be compelled, as a result of the untimely death of our late colleague and my personal friend, to consider the selection of his successor. However, this has to be done.

I know the House will be pleased to hear of the selection I have made. I am pleased to announce to the House that I have selected, designated, and appointed as majority whip one of the most likable Members of the House, one of the most efficient Members of the House, one whom I predict will make a great majority whip, our distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JOHN LESNIAK— VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 768)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4723, a bill for the relief of the legal guardian of John Lesniak.

It appears that John Lesniak, a boy 12 years of age, while playing on a vacant lot in Elizabeth, N. J., found some dynamite percussion caps buried in some cinders inside a sewer pipe lying on the ground. He took the caps home. Unfortunately, upon striking some object, the caps exploded and injured the boy. It is proposed by the bill under consideration to authorize the payment of the sum of \$2,750 to the boy's legal guardian, as compensation for the personal injuries so sustained by him.

Near the spot where the boy picked up the percussion caps there was located a tool shed of the Work Projects Administration and apparently an inference is drawn that the caps belonged to the Work Projects Administration and were negligently left lying around by one of its employees. An investigation made by the Work Projects Administration demonstrates, however, that no explosives of any kind were used or kept on the project conducted by it at that point and that, consequently, the caps must have been the property of some third person. There does not appear to be a scintilla of evidence to the contrary.

While I regret the occurrence of this accident and extend my sympathy to the boy for the painful injuries which he has sustained, I, nevertheless, feel, in the light of the circumstances involved in the case, that there is no legal or moral obligation on the part of the Government to compensate him.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 8, 1942.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the bill and accompanying document referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the disposition of the regular business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address entitled "The Human Side of the Presidents," by Dr. Wilson. I have an estimate from the Public Printer to the effect that it exceeds the limit by about one-sixth of a page; notwithstanding this, I ask unanimous consent to extend it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects, and in each to include editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PADDUCK] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include some correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES FOR THE DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution, House Resolution 496, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7119) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill

shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as you have heard, the rule allows 2 hours of general debate on the bill H. R. 7119, known as the Edmiston bill, which provides allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes. I know each and every Member is in favor of this legislation. It is legislation in the right direction. It provides allowances to our brave men who have demonstrated to the world that they deserve to have their dependents financially assisted by this Government.

For your information I may say that this bill originally provided for the following allowances: For a wife \$20; for a wife and one child \$30, and for each additional child an additional \$10; for one child where there is no wife \$15, two children \$25, with \$10 per month for each additional child. However, in view of the Senate bill providing for the following increases and the House committee having agreed, I hope it meets with the approval of all Members. These increases were: \$28 for a wife but no child; \$40 for a wife and one child with \$10 per month additional for each additional child; \$20 if there be no wife but one child; and \$30 if there be no wife but two children, with \$10 per month additional for each additional child.

To a divorced wife to whom alimony has been decreed it provides an allowance of \$20. To one dependent parent it provides an allowance of \$15; for two dependent parents \$25; to each disabled and dependent brother or sister, \$5. Family allowance to class B dependents, payable only while the member is dependent upon the enlisted man for chief support, total allowance payable to class B shall not exceed \$50 per month. If total exceeds \$50 it shall be apportioned between the dependents.

The bill also provides that the enlisted man shall have deducted from his pay \$20 a month for class A or class B dependents, and \$25 for class A and class B dependents.

I believe the committee recommending and concurring in this bill has acted judicially and wisely.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. There is no objection to either the rule or the bill.

The bill aims to liberalize family allowances. In the last war the basic allotment was \$30, \$15 taken out of the pay of the enlisted man and \$15 supplied by the Government.

I understand the Committee on Military Affairs intends to offer a committee amendment which in effect would make the pending bill conform to the bill passed by the Senate which is far more liberal. I am in favor of the Senate bill providing a basic allotment of \$50 for the wife of an enlisted man. This is much-needed legislation and nothing more than a simple act of justice to the wives and dependents of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and Coast Guard. It will help fortify the morale of our armed forces and the families at home.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. As I understand the committee amendment, it will include all of the figures having to do with allotments. The committee amendment will cover that portion of the Senate bill.

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman, as I have not seen the committee amendment which has not yet been released.

In the House bill it is proposed to have the enlisted man deduct \$20 from his pay, the Government to give \$20, making a total of \$40 for a dependent wife.

Under the Senate bill which will be the committee amendment, the enlisted man will pay \$22 and the Government \$28, making a total of \$50 as against \$40 as provided in the original bill from the Military Affairs Committee.

This is a war measure to build up the morale of the veterans who have dependents back home. Naturally, no Member of Congress wants to have a soldier or sailor fighting for his country, while his wife or his children are on the verge of starvation or enduring unnecessary privations and hardships. Congress if it passes this bill will have gone way beyond the amounts that were allotted in the last World War and will make it possible for the draft boards to take married men with wives and dependent children into our armed forces.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the terms of this bill, is the allotment compulsory?

Mr. FISH. I will have to ask the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, because this is virtually a Senate bill we are about to consider.

Mr. THOMASON. The allotment applying to class A, which covers wives and children, is compulsory. Under class B dependents, meaning fathers and sisters, it is not compulsory but within the option of the soldier.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have an inquiry this morning from a wife who has three children. She is not divorced, but she was deserted a year or two ago by her husband, who is now in the personnel of the Navy, and she wants to know whether or not he would be compelled to make this allotment to his wife and three children.

Mr. FISH. Yes. He would come under class A. A wife comes under class A and children come under class A, so it is compulsory and that wife would get \$22 from the husband and \$28 from the Government and \$12 for the first

child and \$10 apiece for the other children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the schedule provided by the Senate bill for the payment of allotments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

The following table indicates the amounts payable in the most typical cases:

	Government contribution	From soldier's pay	Total
To class A:			
Wife, if no child.....	\$28	\$22	\$50
Wife with 1 child.....	40	22	62
Wife with 2 children.....	50	22	72
To class B if there is no class A dependent:			
1 parent.....	15	22	37
2 parents.....	25	22	47
1 parent and 1 sister.....	20	22	42
1 parent and 2 sisters.....	25	22	47
To class B if there is also a class A dependent:			
1 parent.....	15	5	20
2 parents.....	25	5	30
1 parent and 1 sister.....	20	5	25
1 parent and 2 sisters.....	25	5	30

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I am in favor of paying our enlisted men \$50 a month and shall vote for that amount no matter what action the conference committee may take. There should be no further delay in passing the bill providing for \$50 a month as pay for our Army and Navy in the midst of the greatest war in the history of our country. I am glad it also contains increases for the noncommissioned officers and for the second lieutenants. The latter have been underpaid for years.

Mr. Speaker, this ought to be an appropriate place, in view of the remarks made by the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] in reference to the heroism of our victorious fleet at Midway Island and the fine leadership of Admiral Nimitz, to state that our soldiers, both officers and enlisted men, are the equal if not superior to any in the world. They are undergoing a program of intensive training and are now being provided with modern equipment that compares favorably with the best our enemies have produced. Our soldiers are superior in character, intelligence, and physique, and equal to any soldiers in courage and sacrifice. When our Army meets the enemy, no matter where it may be, we should have faith that it will defeat the enemy wherever it meets them in Europe, Africa, or Asia.

I have repeatedly expressed my faith in our Navy, that we have now and have had for a long time past the most efficient, the finest, and the best Navy in the world. Wherever and whenever our Navy meets the Japanese Navy on equal terms we will be victorious.

Under the heroic leadership of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, our Army cannot lose in the Pacific, and under the brilliant leadership of Admiral Nimitz, our Navy will win battles in the Pacific every time it encounters the Japanese Fleet.

The Congress should take every opportunity to uphold the faith of the American people in our Navy. Some timorous people began to lose faith in our Navy as a result of Pearl Harbor. That dastardly attack occurred before war was declared, and might have happened to any nation in the world with the same result. Our Navy today, under the best possible leadership, man for man, gun for gun, and ship for ship, will always defeat the enemy. It is time that the faith of the American people in our Navy be fully maintained and that they have absolute confidence that we will win this war, both on land and on sea. The Axis Nations have reached their apex of power and every day America is getting more powerful and is already nearing its peak of production, which means final victory for our armed forces throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, in considering dependents, what is more important to these fathers and mothers, wives, and children than insurance if their loved ones give their lives and make the supreme sacrifice for their country or become totally disabled?

I have requested these few minutes to discuss an amendment which I propose to offer when the proper point, immediately following title 1, is reached.

This amendment is not hastily conceived, but is only presented after study of the subject of automatic Government insurance since November, prior to Pearl Harbor and our entrance into the war.

Last November I suggested to General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, in committee that it was fundamentally sound and just that any man or woman entering any branch of our armed services should be automatically covered on entrance into the service by insurance. I contended at that time that our Government should pay for at least \$5,000 of this coverage, not as a bonus to our service men or women, but simply as a matter of justice.

In line with that study and contention, and after consultation with the Veterans' Administration as to the wording of the bill, I introduced on February 2, 1942, H. R. 6512. Hearings on this was requested of the Ways and Means Committee without success.

Today I am offering a new title to the present bill, containing the substance of H. R. 6512, and sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the House will give this proposal careful analysis and attention.

This amendment provides that all commissioned officers and enlisted men in the active military or naval service on April 20, 1942, and all persons hereafter entering upon active service during the present war, shall be issued, without examination, national service life insurance in the amount of \$5,000 under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. While such persons continue in the active service, and for 6 months after separation from active service, or 6 months after termination of

the present war as proclaimed by the President, whichever is the earlier date, the premiums of such insurance shall be paid by the Government out of the current appropriations for pay and allowances pertaining to the particular organization under which the active service is performed.

The reason for employing the date of April 20, 1942, is that the act of December 20, 1941, Public, No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, in section 10, provided for automatic insurance of \$5,000 under the National Service Life Insurance Act covering death or total disability over the period from October 8, 1940, to the expiration of 120 days after December 20, 1941.

In view of the fact that this bill might be enacted into law at a date subsequent to April 19, 1942, it provides insurance for any person who has died in or been discharged from active service since April 19, 1942, and prior to date of enactment of the proposed act where such death or discharge resulted from injury or disease incurred in line of duty.

While the Government pays the premiums the insurance would continue as term insurance. However, provision is made whereby the person may convert the \$5,000 or any part thereof in any multiple of \$500 but not less than \$1,000, upon payment by the insured of the excess premium resulting from the conversion.

The issuance of \$5,000 insurance under this bill will not affect the right of any person, otherwise eligible, to apply for or carry additional insurance under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, except that the aggregate amount of insurance under either or both such acts together with the \$5,000 insurance issued under section 1 of this amendment shall not at any time exceed \$10,000.

The provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of the bill would be for application under the bill if enacted into law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, the gentleman's amendment provides that the Government shall pay the premium on \$5,000 worth of insurance for each man who is in the armed forces?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Each man or woman who is in the armed forces today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And that insurance would continue in operation until 6 months after the war terminates?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Or 6 months following that person's severance from active service.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman's amendment is very good.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I know the distinguished gentleman has given much consideration to this question: What has been the attitude of the ex-service men's organizations, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, with respect to the amendment the gentleman proposes to offer?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have in my files letters from many Legion posts throughout the Seventh District of Minnesota. I shall quote later to the House from letters from 12 Legion posts when we are in general debate. These are samples of dozens of similar letters that have come to me which express wholehearted approval of this amendment. There is not a single Legion post in the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota which has written to me on this subject which has not given its unanimous support to this provision. I compliment the men of the Legion, and particularly my own home posts, on being big enough to give willingly to the boys of this war what they themselves did not receive in 1917.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. As a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I can vouch for the intense interest the gentleman has shown all along the line in the matter of insurance for the members of our armed forces. Had the recommendations of the gentleman been followed, we would have had such a provision placed in the law many months ago.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to call to the attention of the Members, for their study, certain provisions in the bill which it seems to me should be amended.

Under the bill as it is today, if a soldier should have a dependent sister only, let us say, she would get \$5 from the Government, but his pay would have to be docked \$20. There is no provision in the bill that his pay shall be docked an equal amount not to exceed \$20, so that soldier would be put in this position: He has a dependent. He would like that dependent to be helped. It is optional with him whether or not he will request that an allowance be made to her. He is faced with this situation, however: If he should request the Government to pay her \$5 a month, then he is immediately obligated to pay and there is immediately deducted from his pay \$20. He might say, "If you pay her \$5, I will pay her \$5 or I will pay her \$10, but I would not want \$20 deducted from my pay just to get a \$5 contribution from the Government for my sister."

The same situation might arise in the case of one parent. One parent would get \$15, but the soldier's pay would immediately be cut \$20. In such cases, in many instances, the soldier would be paying from twice to four times as much as the Government.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman's point is well taken. As the gentleman has pointed out, the bill as written apparently is not quite fair to the borderline cases where the soldiers do not totally support the parents but would like to and should give partial help.

Mr. PACE. My suggestion is that the language be changed so that from the soldier's pay can be deducted an equal amount, but not to exceed \$20.

The other comment I wish to make on the bill is that it would put you in this position—whether or not you want to be there I do not know, and you can decide that for yourselves: You specify particularly how the contribution the Government makes shall be paid. The wife gets \$20, the child gets \$10, the parent gets \$15, the sister or brother gets \$5. But then you say that \$20 shall be deducted from the soldier's pay, but you do not provide in the bill how this \$20 shall be distributed. You merely provide that the \$20 taken from the soldier's pay shall be distributed in such manner as the regulations to be issued may provide.

I cannot for the life of me understand why we should take such care as to say that the money the Government puts up shall be paid this way and that way, so much to the wife, so much to the child, so much to the parent, and so much to the sister or brother, when as to the \$20 the soldier puts into the pot you have no voice and the soldier has no voice. Some departmental head issues a regulation, changeable overnight, and says that the \$20 the soldier puts into the pot can be paid all to the wife, all to the child, all to the parent, all to the brother, or all to the sister.

It certainly seems to me that enacting legislation of this importance, affecting the welfare of millions of soldiers, if you are going to compel them to take \$20 out of their pay and put it into a pot for distribution among their dependents, either the Congress or the soldier himself, one or the other, should say how it shall be distributed, and not fall into the error we have been guilty of so many times, of saying, "Oh, that can be handled by a regulation"; when you have no idea who will issue the regulations or how often the regulations will be changed. Certainly, the soldier is entitled to that protection.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to support the bill which this rule makes in order, H. R. 7119, which has for its purpose the providing of family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States. It is my information that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, which has the bill in charge, will offer amendments when the bill is read, raising the allotments enumerated in section 102 (c) for class A dependents, which amendments I will support. Under these amendments in the case of a serv-

ice man the allotment to the wife with no child will be raised to \$28; to a wife and one child, \$40, with \$10 per month additional for each additional child. If there be no wife but one child, \$20, and if there be no wife but two children \$30, with \$10 per month additional for each additional child.

The War Department has announced as a fixed policy of the Department that it does not contemplate calling to the service as enlisted men any more eligible persons with dependents than the present emergency actually requires. In other words, it is the purpose of the War Department to limit enlistments so far as practicable to those men who do not have dependents. However, there are a number of enlistments where dependency exists. The statistics show, according to the information furnished me, that from 9 to 10 percent of men enlisted in the service have dependents and will come under the provisions of this act.

The class A dependents are the wife and children of the service man. The wife will receive a minimum of \$50 per month, being \$22 contributed by the soldier or sailor and \$28 by the Government. This payment is mandatory and is received as a matter of right, without dependency. The class B dependents, however, will not be entitled to payments unless requests therefor have been made by the soldier or sailor or by someone in his behalf.

We all realize that the financial burden for carrying the war is enormous and is going to fall heavily upon the tax-paying public. However, we realize too that the men who are called to the service and who have no choice but must burn their bridges behind them and deprive themselves of all opportunity to carry on their occupations and must, in addition, subject themselves to the hazard of the battle line, are entitled to every consideration by their Government. They certainly are entitled to have reasonable allowances provided for their families where dependencies exist. The morale of the American Army is high and it must be kept so, and proper and adequate treatment for the wives and children of soldiers is essential in building and maintaining morale. I feel that the American public will approve the action we are taking today in making suitable provision now for the dependents of our fighting forces, and I am glad to give my support to this bill and to the amendments which will be offered.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that the Seventy-seventh Congress stands out as the whipping boy upon whom has been subjected a ceaseless barrage of criticism, insult, and abuse. Yet after the history of the Seventy-seventh Congress is fully written, it will stand out as the one agency which brought home to the people the necessity of taking care of the armed forces of the United States.

Probably no Congress in the history of the Nation has given more consideration to the needs of the men in the armed forces than this Congress. For the past 2 years, ever since the trouble in Europe

began to involve the United States and it became necessary for us to build a great Army and Navy for our national defense, the House has repeatedly considered measure after measure, until now the benefits which have been given to the soldiers and the sailors are comparable to those possessed by the forces of Australia and other parts of the British Empire who are now seeing service overseas.

For instance, about a year and a half ago, after the Selective Service Act was introduced and passed, although the original proposal was \$5 a month for men in the armed forces, discussion immediately came up about raising the pay of those men from \$21 to \$42 and from there on up until last week the House approved \$50 a month for every soldier and sailor. It is my hope that as time goes on further benefits for these men who are doing so much in the service of their country will be considered favorably by the Congress as a whole.

Some of the other proposals which have been made in the Seventy-seventh Congress include free transportation during furlough for all the soldiers and sailors in our armed forces. Although this question has been before the House and has been rejected several times, it is my fond hope that as time goes on and it becomes more and more evident to the House and to the Congress that the parents back home want to see other steps like these taken, so their boys can get home when they are on furlough, such a measure eventually will be approved and passed by the House.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished members of the House Military Affairs Committee for the very fair consideration they have given, time after time and occasion after occasion, to the constructive proposals that have been made by individual Members of the House. I think it is a tribute to them and the House as a whole that measures and propositions of this kind will come before the House for our consideration. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] should be given particular notice at this time for his determination to offer an amendment proposing \$5,000 of free insurance for every man in the armed service. Certainly his proposal is well worth the consideration of the House, and I hope it will be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad indeed that Congress is going to do something for the dependents of the men who are in the service. I think one of the things that makes a good soldier is that he does not have to worry about his family back home. If we would just let this bill now in conference pass now, which will give the soldiers \$50 a month, and also takes care of his dependents, we are going to increase the morale of the Army to a very large extent, and the men will have their minds then on winning this war instead of thinking about what is going to happen to their families

while they are away, because they know when they get back home themselves they can be taken care of.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, once more may I have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the chairman of the Rules Committee? I do this because I want to enlist his influence in support of this proposition which we are going to have before us in a few days with respect to pay for the fighting men. You know, the administration all through has been going along with union leaders, both Green and Murray, and on occasion with John Lewis. I do not know which one it is going to decide to follow, whether Lewis, Murray, or Green, or whether it will finally see that the unorganized worker gets justice. Perhaps the gentleman has that knowledge. But the administration has gone along with the union politicians and some of their union activities, which compel every American citizen to pay tribute to one or the other of these labor organizations in order to work in defense of this country. The support which is asked now is on this conference report which is coming back here where the other body has cut down that amount of \$50 which we thought the soldiers were entitled to receive to \$46 per month. I hope the gentleman will join with the minority Members, although I do not speak for them, but join with those who want to pay the fighting men this increase, and do it now. I have heard the gentleman from Illinois talk very often about increases in pay. Now I hope he will stand by the proposition that the House decided was right and fair and pay these fighting men this \$50 a month and not vote for the conference report, which, as one gentleman on the other side of the Capitol said, would "chisel" them out of \$8. That may be the administration's measure, but let us here go this time with our fighting men.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when I originally explained the bill, I was not aware of the fact that the House Committee on Military Affairs had agreed to the Senate amendments increasing the allowances and, therefore, I shall correct my previous remarks and give the correct changes.

Earlier in the day the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] called my attention to a condition affecting the good fishermen of his State which he claimed they received at the hands of what he terms "New Dealers." Of course, I am obliged to say that I do not know anything about the matter. However, I do know that the fishermen of Michigan could perhaps obtain larger hauls if Michigan industries would not pollute Lake Michigan which is responsible for the diminishing supply of fish in that lake.

I hope he will call attention to many of the manufacturers who are responsible for this pollution of Lake Michigan and urge that they desist in violating the health regulations and the laws not only of the Federal Government but of their own State.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will tell the gentleman about that. If you Chicago fellows did not want to suck all the water out of the Great Lakes and out of Lake Michigan especially, and run it down through the Chicago drainage canal to take care of the filth of the city of Chicago, and also if the Booth Fish Co. did not put prices down to a point where men could not make a living, we would still have more fish.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman uses an expression which I suppose is common in Michigan, but we are not sucking out any of the water that we are not entitled to. We have taken what was allocated to us by the War Department, and later on by the Supreme Court of the United States, and I say to the gentleman, notwithstanding that we are taking 1,500 cubic feet per second, the levels of the lakes are higher than they ever were before, and since our diversion we have spent \$200,000,000 on the sanitary canal to purify the water, and make possible water transportation between the Great Lakes and the southern and Gulf sections of our country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What the gentleman means is that the more water you take out of the lakes, the more there is left, just like this New Deal economic policy, that the more you spend the more you have.

Mr. SABATH. And I say to the gentleman that he is pretty resourceful, but we spend more, yes; but we take in more, and where our national income was only \$40,000,000,000 in 1933, the national income today is \$100,000,000,000 a year, so you can spend more when you get it in, and we have been getting it in because the country is prosperous, and I hope it will continue to be prosperous under this administration, under the New Deal that the gentleman is so displeased with. The gentleman stated something about his hoping that I will vote for the House provision of \$50. I say to him that in my desire to secure the increased pay to the boys from \$21 I was hopeful we might be able to double it, and when we got it to \$42 I was tickled pink.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not mean pink, does he?

Mr. SABATH. I never dreamed that the House would be as liberal as it was, and, therefore, I rather would be satisfied with \$42 than to delay the consideration of the bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a statement made by the majority leader and by a few other gentlemen who are congratulating the Navy upon its efficiency, as well as the Army. Somehow or other they have omitted to say anything about the Air Corps, and I think that is the department that is entitled to equal or a greater deal of congratulations, and the thanks on the part of the country for the wonderful service which they have rendered. As to the Navy, permit me to call the attention of

those who refuse to see and who refuse to hear, that it was President Roosevelt who from the very moment he took office, started to build up our Navy, and had it not been for him and his advocacy in 1933, 1934, and 1935, and every year thereafter, of bringing about efficiency in the Navy and an increase in our Navy and merchant marine, I regret to say that perhaps these congratulations to the Navy and the Army would not have been in order today. If there is one man who is entitled to be congratulated and to whom the country should be grateful, it is to his great Commander in Chief, our President, who foresaw the danger to our country, and notwithstanding that it is generally known to all, yet unfortunately some of these gentlemen who for some reason or other like to find fault with the New Deal, never give the President the cooperation or credit to which he is entitled; but the future historians and a sincere people will undoubtedly recognize the great and valuable service which the President has rendered to our country and to the democracies the world over.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. THOM. Is it not a fact that during the early days when we were making public-works appropriations the President was criticized for allocating some of the money from that fund to the building up of warships?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, yes; but I do not wish now to say anything that might be displeasing to the gentlemen who have been criticizing all the time, because most of them are beginning to recognize the mistakes that they have made, and they are going along now with the administration and the President, because they realize that they made a mistake in not doing so in the early days, and, therefore, I would not say anything that would be construed by them as being unkindly and unfair.

I am mighty glad to see them cooperate and aid in every possible way. We have witnessed it today on the bills that were passed by unanimous consent. I think they will continue to cooperate in the future. We need this unity and I do not want to say anything that would create the slightest possible disunity in the House or in the country, and I hope that these gentlemen, including the gentleman from Michigan, will realize that we are at war and that it is necessary to strengthen the hands of our President and not find fault which, after all, may impede his efforts to an early and successful conclusion of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the American people will continue to appreciate and recognize and realize the great service that these armed forces of ours, under the leadership of our great President, have rendered to America and made possible the victories that have been ours in the past few days and those that I hope will be ours in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7119) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7119, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before I make a brief statement about the general provisions of this bill I should like to concur in some of the very fine and deserved tributes that have today been paid to my long-time friend, Admiral Nimitz. I am sure we all thoroughly appreciate the fine work that the Navy has done ever since the war began, and even before, but particularly in the Pacific during the last few days.

It so happens that when I first became a Member of this body nearly 12 years ago, the town of Fredericksburg, Tex., where Admiral Nimitz was born, was in the congressional district that I had the honor to represent for 4 years. I know Admiral Nimitz well. I know some of his family. Above all, I know the high esteem and affection in which he is held by the people of the historic old town of Fredericksburg, Tex., and likewise by the people all over southwest Texas. In fact, if you ever have the good fortune to visit that old town you will see a famous hotel, one of the oldest in Texas and in the Southwest, named for his distinguished grandfather. It was from that very town that Admiral Nimitz was appointed a midshipman to the United States Naval Academy. From that day until this his record has been replete with distinguished service not only to the Navy but to his country. We are all praying for him and his men today, and I feel sure they will achieve a glorious victory.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that today I am acting chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs because the distinguished chairman, Mr. MAY, is unavoidably absent from the city on important business, and I am in charge of the bill. Therefore, it has fallen to my lot to make a brief statement regarding the bill and to allot such time as those desiring to speak shall request.

I may say that the committee has given a lot of time and a lot of serious thought and consideration to this legislation. That is particularly true of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON], who is the author of the bill, and who has been giving it study ever since he has been a Member of this body, and I think ever since the last war, in which he played an important part.

I believe you will find, when the committee has offered committee amendments which were unanimously agreed to in committee this morning, that there

are in fact very few, if any, matters of controversy remaining. So I should like, at the outset of my remarks, to say that the committee this morning, by unanimous vote, changed the figures on page 3 of the bill, if you will be kind enough to refer to it, so as to conform to the figures in the bill passed by the Senate last week.

The House bill originally provided for payment to a dependent wife of \$20 per month, and we propose to offer an amendment at the proper time raising that to \$28.

The House bill provided for a wife and one child, \$30. We propose to raise that to \$40, with the same provision for \$10 additional for each child.

In line 11, section 3, of the House bill we originally provided that if there be no wife, but one child, the payment should be \$15. We propose to raise that to \$20 to conform to the Senate figure.

Likewise in section 12 where the House bill provided that if there be no wife but two children, the payment should be the sum of \$25. We raised that to \$30.

The only other substantial difference is that the House bill provided that the soldier should have taken from his monthly pay the sum of \$20 and that the Government should match that with \$20 for a dependent wife and with \$10 for each child. But if the amendment which the committee proposes later to offer is accepted, then there will be taken from the soldier's pay the sum of \$22, and the Government will contribute \$28 to the dependent wife, making the total allowance to the dependent wife \$50, and substantially the same amounts then for dependent children, and likewise for those mentioned in class B, such as dependent fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What would the gentleman say with regard to the question which I think has been raised here possibly informally, as to whether or not a soldier could make a partial dependency allotment?

Mr. THOMASON. That is a matter for the consideration of the House. The same question was given consideration by the committee. The Members will understand, of course, that when it comes to class A dependents, meaning a wife and dependent minor children, or a former divorced wife who is still drawing alimony, it is compulsory; but when you get down to the question of dependent parents and dependent brothers and sisters, it is within the discretion and only upon the request of the soldier himself that any allowance is made.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am thinking of some instances in which only a partial dependency may exist; it may be that the dependent has some little income from an additional source.

Mr. THOMASON. I appreciate the point raised by the gentleman. I believe that point was made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. Perhaps some amendment should be offered placing a limitation on the sol-

dier's contribution, so that the soldier should not contribute as much as \$22 in a case such as the gentlemen mentioned; and perhaps it should not be made compulsory that he has to contribute \$22 to a dependent brother, a class B dependent, when the Government contributes only \$5. I appreciate the force of the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman spoke of compulsory allotments in the case of class A dependents. Would that also hold as to class B dependents where there are no class A dependents?

Mr. THOMASON. In any event, under the provisions of the bill, before class B dependents get an allowance the soldier must request it. The Government pays nothing to class B dependents unless the soldier has requested it and dependency is established. It is therefore reduced to a matter of whether or not the soldier feels like contributing to the support of the brother or sister or father or mother. He has the option, if he wishes to exercise it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Would that apply where there are no class A dependents?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; I think the same rule would prevail.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. One other question: Why is the time delayed for 4 months before the bill goes into operation? The gentleman has doubtless received many letters, just as I have, dealing with this subject.

Mr. THOMASON. I believe one of the principal reasons was that the War Department and the Navy Department, who are to administer the law, felt that the matter is such a big job and so complicated that it might take them perhaps that long to set up the proper accounting system and records. There is another thing that ought to be considered and I am sure will be by the membership just as it was by the House Committee on Military Affairs, and that is the committee felt they ought not to make the payments so large or the attraction so great that married men would rush to enlist or that draft boards would hasten to begin the more or less wholesale induction of married men with dependents so long as unmarried men were available.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Did we not have legislation similar to this during World War No. 1?

Mr. THOMASON. We had substantially this same legislation except at that time the soldier contributed \$15 and the Government \$15. This time there will be a minimum of \$50, but it might go to very much more than that if the man had several dependent children.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The rates are changed somewhat because the compensation of the soldiers will be changed soon. Is not that also a reason?

Mr. THOMASON. That might have been one consideration, because it is now certain that within the next week or two the private soldier is going to receive \$46 or \$50. In the other war the soldier received a maximum of \$30.

He will soon get \$46 and very likely \$50. In the other war the private married soldier received an allotment of \$15 to his wife, and his own \$15, making a total of \$30. Now she will receive an allotment of \$28 from the Government and \$22 from her husband, making a total of \$50. So in the judgment of the committee the differential has been pretty well taken care of.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Can the gentleman give us any figures as to the prospective numbers of men this legislation will make available?

Mr. THOMASON. I believe it has been estimated that it would be approximately 9 percent.

Mr. EDMISTON. From 9 to 12 percent, if the gentleman will permit an interruption.

Mr. THOMASON. I am advised by the gentleman from West Virginia that it is between 9 and 12 percent. As I recall the hearings there are 161,000 in service now who have dependents, and I may say this covers the Regular Army and the National Guard. Of course, this number is going to increase, and probably very rapidly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I may say this bill covers every enlisted man in the service, whether a Regular soldier, a National Guardsman, or an inductee. It does not include commissioned officers. Up to this time the relative percentage of inductees with dependents has been very small, and certainly it is to be hoped that the war situation may improve so that not too many inductees will be called who have dependents. But that is the real justification for this law.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Has the committee considered whether this would give enough additional strength that the legislation would have any effect in changing the lower age limit for the draft?

Mr. THOMASON. No. The committee gave that no consideration. It is my own personal feeling that while it does have a material bearing on it, it should not be taken into consideration at the present time in connection with this legislation. This is purely an allotment and allowance bill.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman tell me whether the compulsory feature with regard to class A dependents applies with equal force to cases where there is an estrangement between husband and wife?

Mr. THOMASON. So long as she is his legal wife, certainly she will receive a total of \$50, or if there has been a divorce and she still draws alimony she is protected.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Regardless of the fact they are estranged?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; so long as she is his legal wife.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Going over to the language on page 5 of the bill, line 9, if I understood the gentleman correctly there is an amendment coming through where that amount of \$20 a month will be increased to \$22?

Mr. THOMASON. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then applying that back to page 3, would the wife be paid \$50; that is, \$22 being taken out of the soldier's pay and the Government contributing \$28?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What will be the situation on the wife and child?

Mr. THOMASON. The child then would receive \$12, as provided in both the Senate and House bills, in addition to the \$50 received by the wife.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Those figures on page 3 are to be changed?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes. On page 3, I have already called the attention of the committee to the fact that in line 9 a wife and one child would receive \$40. The other figure is not changed. In line 11, a soldier with no wife and one child would receive \$20 instead of \$15.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That explains it.

Mr. THOMASON. In line 12, if there be no wife but two children, the two dependent children would receive \$30 instead of \$25.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Assuming then that the other bill goes through that has been compromised on the basis of \$46 a month, the maximum taken out of a serviceman's pay would be \$22 a month?

Mr. THOMASON. With this exception: That \$22 is taken off the soldier's pay for a dependent wife. Should he elect to ask for some contribution to those in class B, like a father, mother, brothers, or sisters, his total contribution would then be \$27, because he must contribute \$5 in order to come under the class B provision. If I am not right about that I hope the gentleman from West Virginia will correct me.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That brings up another question on page 3, class B. Of that \$15 and \$25 the soldier puts up only \$5?

Mr. THOMASON. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. As I understand this bill, a soldier having one dependent parent, the parent will receive how much?

Mr. THOMASON. Five dollars from the soldier and \$22, making a total of \$27.

Mr. EDMISTON. No. That is not correct.

Mr. THOMASON. Pardon me. He would receive a total of \$22 plus \$15 or \$37.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose that same parent has two sons in the Army, can they divide that and each contribute \$11 of their pay?

Mr. THOMASON. There is no specific provision in the bill to cover that,

but I think it might well be left to the fairness and discretion of the War Department.

Mr. CURTIS. It is entirely reasonable that the one allowance would be all that the parent should have.

Mr. THOMASON. I may say to my friend it is almost impossible to cover in a bill like this every possible contingency that may arise; so we have given the War and Navy Departments full authority and jurisdiction in the matter in order that justice may be done in cases like the gentleman has just mentioned.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intent of the committee that rules shall be made so the boy can allot less than \$22?

Mr. THOMASON. That question was raised a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], and I think there is considerable force in his contention. Perhaps there ought to be an amendment of some sort that he shall not be required to contribute more than \$22. If the Government is only contributing \$15, perhaps the soldier should not be required to contribute more than the Government. I repeat, though, you must lodge discretion and authority somewhere. You just cannot write everything into the law.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago you mentioned your committee agreed on the amount of \$22 instead of \$20 now carried in the bill. No doubt the increase of \$2 is made possible by the increased pay the private and seaman will receive under the pay bill Congress is about to pass?

Mr. THOMASON. That was taken into consideration, I may say. May I also say that the committee has given a lot of serious thought and consideration to this bill for the past 3 months, but in view of the fact that it is now certain the soldiers will receive at least \$46, and most likely \$50, base pay, it was thought only fair for the Government to put up \$28, so the wife would receive a total of \$50, and that it was fair and equitable for the soldier to put up \$22.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Right.

Mr. THOMASON. I am glad to hear somebody approve what the committee has done, because we do not always meet with that response. We have worked very hard and we think have done a fine job.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to add my word of approval of the substance of this measure.

Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say now that this provision is about on a par as to liberality with the provision made in the first World War?

Mr. THOMASON. It is substantially the same legislation, but I would say much more liberal. As far as the policy of the law is concerned, it is exactly the same, but I repeat that in World War No. 1 the soldier had \$15 taken from his pay and the Government contributed \$15. His base pay was \$30. In a few days the base pay of the present soldier will be

\$50, and instead of his wife receiving \$30 she is going to receive \$50, so I would say we are being very liberal along all fronts.

Mr. MURDOCK. Before taking my seat, may I say specifically that I believe the committee has done a good piece of work on this subject. I listened to what the gentleman from El Paso, Tex., had to say about our victorious admiral from Texas, and I led the applause which followed it. However, I think there may be more than one way to show our applause for our fighting men. The liberal provisions of this bill are another way to show applause of our fighting men. I congratulate the committee upon its work.

Mr. THOMASON. Everybody is applauding Admiral Nimitz, but it certainly is a little unusual for anybody to applaud the House Committee on Military Affairs. I will say for myself and my colleagues on the committee that we very much appreciate your generous compliment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am talking about applause for our fighting men and their dependents who are covered in this bill, and I also congratulate the committee on its splendid work.

Mr. THOMASON. I am glad to know the high opinion that the Members hold for the Committee on Military Affairs during the present crisis when so much military legislation is necessary.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman feel the amount of allotment provided in this bill will be adequate for these dependents to exist on when taking into consideration the increased cost of living?

Mr. THOMASON. As was said the other day in connection with the pay bill, you cannot pay a fighting soldier what he deserves. It is impossible to adequately reward patriotism and bravery. Certainly you cannot pay dependent members of the fighting man's family what they deserve. However, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] so frequently asks, "Where are you going to get the money?" I would like to pay them 10 times the amount carried in this bill. You have to draw the line somewhere if you are going to have any Treasury left at all. If the Government is going to have any credit or survive after this war is over, we must use good judgment and exercise business sense. We have certainly leaned to the liberal side. All doubts have been resolved in favor of the soldier and his family.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] in charge of the work of the Committee on Military Affairs is done by subcommittees in these days, and many men do not receive credit for the painstaking work and study that they put in on these bills. The gentle-

man from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and others on the majority side who have worked on subcommittees are chiefly responsible for a good deal of the legislation that is brought out.

I wish to pay my respects also to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON], the author of this bill.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] has said, a committee amendment has been agreed upon which in effect adopts somewhat higher rates of allotment than the provision of the House bill. This amendment is to be offered at the appropriate time.

I would also like to submit a few observations on the question of war-risk insurance. I was one of those who favored the theory of war-risk insurance, the expense thereof to be shared jointly if possible by the soldier and the Government. I, like many other Members of both the House and the Senate Committees on Military Affairs, discovered with amazement what we would be up against in this war if we attempted to write into a bill \$10,000 worth of war-risk insurance, the expense of which would be borne by the men and the Government.

The gentleman from Illinois has some very illuminating and informative figures on this question. I may say that in the last war, while it was assumed that the soldier put up an amount equal to that contributed by the Government, the experience of the last war, after it was all over, showed that the Government paid for the insurance five times the comparatively small sum the soldier put up. The ratio was about five to one, yet our casualty list was comparatively small in the last war, approximately 50,000 men.

We have today voluntary insurance. The figures submitted by the authorities show that any attempt to impose, on top of the voluntary insurance which a large majority of our soldiers and sailors now carry, additional war-risk insurance in the amount of \$10,000 might very easily, in view of a higher casualty list in this war, would result in a cost to the Government out of reason and into many billions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the author of the bill, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON], 10 minutes.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I want first to explain to you, as has been done before. If you are looking at the House bill I am afraid it may be somewhat confusing to you, inasmuch as the committee this morning adopted the figures of the Senate bill. If you will send for the Senate report you will find in there a table on these figures which is very clarifying. The number of the Senate report is 1475.

Under this bill, the dependents of soldiers and sailors are divided into two classes, class A and class B. The allotment to be made by soldiers with class A dependents, that is, a wife and children, or either, is compulsory under the bill. The soldier with a wife or children or both must provide for them under this bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman from Texas made a splendid statement. As I understood his statement, if a man is legally married to a woman and she is dependent he will have to make the contribution. I wonder if there is any provision in the bill, or if the agency administering this law would have the right to do it, that would prevent a dissolute woman, say, although she may be poor and dependent, from receiving the benefit a soldier at the front is contributing to her.

Mr. EDMISTON. As long as she is legally his wife, he must make the allotment, as the bill is written, as I understand it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understood, the gentleman said that relationship, not dependency, governs in class A. Is it not true, however, that if neither the wife nor the soldier applied, or if neither of them wanted to get it, there would be no allotment made? For instance, there might be a couple where the wife was well fixed and did not want the money and the soldier did not want her to have it, and neither of them put in an application for it. There would be no compulsion in that case.

Mr. EDMISTON. The way the bill is written, if his record showed that he was married he would have to make the allotment. The wife could send it back to him, but the allotment would be compulsory if he has a wife.

I wish to bring out here that, for example, a soldier or sailor with just a wife would allot \$22 under the amendment that was adopted in committee this morning. The Government would add \$28, making a total of \$50 as a monthly allotment to the wife.

As another example, take the case of a man with a child, but no wife, the soldier or sailor would allot \$22 and the Government would pay \$20, and the child would receive \$42. In the case of a wife with three children the total would be \$82 to the family of the soldier or sailor with a wife and three children.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] asked a moment ago about a comparison with World War No. 1 provisions. These are much more liberal than the allotment and allowance bill of World War No. 1.

I have some figures compiled in the consideration of this bill which I think are interesting. In World War No. 1, with 4,700,000 men in the armed forces of our country, approximately 45 percent of that number made dependent allotments, and of the 45 percent making allotments, 26.8 percent made class A allotments to wives and children; 68.2 percent made class B allotments to dependent parents, grandparents, brothers, sisters, or an additional parent.

The House bill differs from the Senate bill with respect to class B dependents, in that under class B dependents in the

House bill there are only included father, mother, and dependent brother or sister.

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNES. I think the gentleman made a misstatement there. Brother and sister of a soldier or sailor must be both disabled and dependent.

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes; the gentleman is correct. I thank him for the correction.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Does that mean that a small child, a little boy or a little girl, who has in fact been dependent on the man who is going to war, will not be entitled to anything unless that little boy or girl is disabled?

Mr. EDMISTON. The language of the House bill refers to a dependent parent or a disabled and dependent brother or sister.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. So if a soldier is supporting his little brother, that little brother will have to be disabled before he is entitled to any benefits?

Mr. EDMISTON. I am glad the gentleman brought out that point.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Is that the intention?

Mr. EDMISTON. That would be my interpretation of the language of the House bill. The Senate bill does not have it that way.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. That seems unfortunate.

Mr. EDMISTON. Sixty-eight and two-tenths percent in World War No. 1 made class B allotments, which shows a far greater number of men made allotments to parents rather than to wives and children. In World War No. 1 only 4 percent made allotments to combined dependents of both class A and class B.

Both the War and Navy Departments favor the enactment of this legislation. Both branches of the service appreciate the fact that the morale of the soldier or sailor, when he knows he is contributing at least something to the support of his loved ones at home, is greatly improved.

One point where there is a difference between the House bill and the bill as passed by the Senate last week is title II of the Senate bill, which I would like to talk about for a few moments. In the House report we clearly state just what the Senate has in their bill with respect to title II, and I think title II of the Senate measure should go into this bill. The closing paragraph of the House report says—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from West Virginia 5 additional minutes.

Mr. EDMISTON. The closing paragraph of the House report states:

Your committee is cognizant of the fact that the amounts set forth in this bill may not be wholly adequate in all instances. However, it is in full accord with the views expressed by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, in hearings before the committee, that said

amounts should not be wholly adequate. Your committee believes that it would be injurious to the welfare of our country to have local draft boards feel that men with families can be freely inducted into the armed services. There is certainly a genuine social reason for preserving established families. Neither does your committee feel that it would be to the best interests of our Nation to enact legislation which might give the impression to local draft boards that financial considerations are the only basis upon which families are established and maintained. In other words, established families should not be indiscriminately uprooted and torn from their mooring solely because of the fact that their financial needs have been taken care of, and we certainly do not, by the passage of this legislation, wish to give either the local draft boards or the American public such an impression.

This is the language of the report accompanying the bill and to put this language into existing law title II, as passed by the Senate, should be included in this legislation. I certainly hope the conferees on the part of the House will bear this in mind and go along with the Senate and the intent of the House Committee of Military Affairs as contained in the report accompanying this bill.

I shall now read to you the only change in the existing law that title II of the Senate bill puts in, which is as follows:

For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of men is advisable because of their status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support, any allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration but the fact that such allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents.

They go further than that with this language in the Senate:

The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes.

That language as put in the Senate bill to my mind does just what we say in the report that we want to do and intend to do, so I think title II of the Senate bill should be in the House bill. That last paragraph provides under existing law that you cannot take a man whose family is not financially dependent upon him if the draft board raises the issue. Just last week an appeal case was taken to the President on those grounds, and under the law he could not defer that man, although he was married and had several children. Under this law those cases can be taken care of under title II of the Senate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. I think the Military

Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, has done a very fine job in reporting this bill to the House. There seems to be little difference of opinion in the membership as to the benefits that will be derived from this piece of legislation. The time is here when the problems of dependency of those in the service must be faced. I am glad that we brought this bill out for immediate consideration. The bill will give to those boys who are taken into service a little bit of comfort in the days that they are serving their country, and will give to them a better feeling of security knowing that their dependents are receiving allotments and allowances which will help to tide such dependents over until the soldier or sailor is again earning his pay check in civilian life.

I call your attention to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota and read to you from a letter I have that gives additional information regarding the insurance features of World War No. 1 policies, the cost to the individual in service and the cost to the Government. Likewise the letter sets forth the possibilities of what might happen if every individual were granted free insurance in this war.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], stated that he would offer his amendment to this bill making the life-insurance features compulsory. I stand opposed to that for the reasons which I shall emphasize in reading to you several paragraphs from this letter, information that came from the Veterans' Bureau. Let me read:

Premiums on war-risk insurance were fixed on the basis of the American experience table of mortality which, of course, was intended to cover only a peacetime hazard, and provision was made for the United States to pay all administrative expenses and bear the entire losses traceable to the extra hazards of the military and naval services. The insurance was issued on a step-rate yearly renewable term plan. Under this so-called war-risk insurance program net premiums were collected in the amount of \$454,045,605.35, whereas the losses aggregated \$2,264,866,202.96, the ratio of losses to premiums being approximately 5 to 1. The premium charge for a man 26 years of age was \$6.70 per month for \$10,000 insurance, which turned out to be nothing greatly more than a token payment since on the basis of losses suffered if the insurance were to have been self-sustaining the premium charge should have been for the same man approximately \$33.50 per month, or \$3.50 in excess of his entire pay were he a private and entitled to no additions to the base pay. It will be perceived from this explanation that in fact the burden of paying the premium was distributed one-fifth to the man and four-fifths to the United States. It is hardly to be expected that during this war a more favorable experience will be encountered; in fact, a much less favorable one would not be unlikely.

The very basic theory of insurance comprehends that a group will together bind themselves to make contributions in ratio to the respective risks so that the aggregate of all the natural premiums will balance out the losses. This, of course, did not and was not expected to take place in war-risk insurance, otherwise the Government would not have entered the field, because commercial insurers would have probably been willing to accept the risks were adequate premiums payable. However, it is obvious that

it would have been impossible for all but a relatively few of the members of the armed forces to have contributed \$30 or \$35 per month, which would have been the minimum necessary premium charge were the insurance to have been operated in the customary manner.

In summarizing, it may be said that war-risk insurance was principally a gratuity not dissimilar to pensions. While it may be contended that the payment of token premiums for war-risk insurance cause it to partake of some slight semblance of an insurance program, such similarity completely fades as far as automatic insurance is concerned. Even were the fiction to be indulged in of the insurer paying the premiums to itself still the cost would be the aggregate paid out so that the total amount paid as losses would represent a pure and unadulterated gratuity. Were \$5,000 of the so-labeled automatic insurance to be authorized for each individual in an army which suffered a million fatalities, and this would seem to be a modest loss when cognizance is taken of the fact that during the last war Germany with a population of approximately 65,000,000 alone lost over twice that number, the cost to the insurer would be \$5,000,000,000 exclusive of any administrative expenses. Were the number of losses to approximate those of Germany in the last war the cost on the same basis would exceed \$10,000,000,000. This is cited so that a clear understanding may be had of the large amounts involved.

It is realized that no monetary payments can ever indemnify those who have had their dear ones taken from them, but aside from insurance the Government has provided a system of disability and death pensions for all cases in which disability or death occurs in line of duty, and it may be conservatively said that under this system now in effect the Federal Government will find itself obligated to pay many billions of dollars to the veterans of World War No. 2. As a matter of information it may be generally said that this pension system covers all those disabled or dying while in the military or naval services (excluding only those whose disability or death were occasioned as the result of their own misconduct). As an example, if the service person is totally disabled entitlement thereby is established to receive \$100 per month during the entire period of the existence of such disability, or if the person dies of a service-connected disability leaving a dependent parent, \$45 per month is payable to such dependent if such dependency continues during the entire period of life.

With this argument, I feel if the House understands the situation, it will refrain from adopting the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. From the standpoint of the possible prohibitive cost to the Government I feel that this matter of giving free insurance to the boys should be passed up, and particularly so since we are now increasing the pay of the buck private to \$50 per month and also making possible the rather liberal and fair allotments and allowances under this bill. If the boys want the insurance they have the right to purchase such insurance at rates far below what it will cost the Government. I do not think that we should make a compulsory matter of it at all.

I yield back the remainder of my time. Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, it would seem as though it came somewhat

as a surprise a moment ago when I, together with one or two other members, had something good to say about this committee drafting the bill. You know, Mr. Chairman, we meant what we said. This is a complicated measure and it is impossible for all members to know whether all these details have been worked out properly. But with all the study which the committee members have put on it, we will assume that details have been well worked out. It is a general principle involved here however, which I think all of us approve. How much of this deduction for relatives is compulsory and how much optional? I understand that the allotments that the soldier makes to his wife and children are obligatory.

Mr. THOMASON. Provided they are dependents.

Mr. MURDOCK. Provided they are dependents.

Mr. THOMASON. The allotment to the wife and children would be compulsory in any event.

Mr. MURDOCK. They would be obligatory, but all other allotments are voluntary, and that I think has good features. We are probably soon increasing the pay of the common soldier to \$50 per month and increasing his opportunity to show his own attitude and obligation toward his loved ones by making these allotments. Thus the Government is really encouraging that proper attitude. It is a fine thing and will help the morale of the soldier as well as the morale of the country in general.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Mississippi in regard to this, as well as in regard to many other matters concerning our country's defenders.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I want to state to the gentleman from Arizona that the Senate has just instructed the conferees to accept the \$50 base pay for the men in the service. This was done by a vote of 58 to 20.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am delighted to hear that report from the gentleman from Mississippi. He is alert to the interest of our soldiers in wars past and present. I approved of his amendment several days ago to increase the base pay to \$50 per month when he offered it to the bill that was before the House. I had also favored the same proposition when offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] many months ago in the original Selective Training and Service Act.

Now, with reference to one other matter. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], in opening the argument on this bill, spoke of the remarkable work for victory done in the Pacific by his fellow citizen from Texas, Admiral Nimitz—a worthy tribute. That is fine indeed but there is a more practical way we can applaud our fighting men.

Let me illustrate a practical attitude. I remember as a small boy going to a burning farmhouse of a neighbor. The house had been destroyed by fire. Hundreds had gathered around and were helping

save a few things. All were shaking their head and saying how sorry they were. But an old fellow who was not known particularly for his religious connections took off his hat and went around among the neighbors and said, "I am sorry, too. I am sorry \$5 worth, How sorry are you?" He collected quite a sum of money from those neighbors who showed their sympathy by liberal donations.

We talk a lot on the floor of this House and in the press and over the radio about our fighting men. Fine words are fitting and proper and well deserved. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas this proper legislation is the best kind of applause you can furnish the fighting men. That is what I meant awhile ago when I did not have time to finish a statement—provision made in legislation, suitable financial provision, symbolic of our attitude toward those fighting men and their dependents, such as this measure makes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am very much in favor of this bill. Concerning what the gentleman said a moment ago, I have such great faith in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who is handling this bill, that I am satisfied it is a good bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is one of my reasons for supporting it entirely, without knowing all the details, I may say.

Mr. Chairman, the present generation of American youth, mostly men who have been born since 1910, are bearing the brunt of this war. No pay that we can vote them as soldiers, no provision such as in this bill we can make for their dependents, will quite show our appreciation and America's debt to those finest young people who are fighting for the survival of our country and Christian civilization as we know it. Many times we have talked about a war to end all wars. It is too much to be hoped for in human affairs. We know that the other World War did not do what we contemplated it would do. I have confidence that in this case—this war will not end all wars, human nature being what it is—I do think that great wars in the future will be forestalled much longer and spaced much farther apart than the life of a single generation through the efforts of the men who are now fighting this conflict. Let us oldsters do the right thing by them now and later.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have here samples of letters received from American Legion posts in my home congressional district, the seventh of Minnesota, in reference to an amendment I intend to offer providing for an automatic life-insurance policy of \$5,000. I shall read some of these letters into the Record. They are letters which express the opinions of veterans of the last war. These Legion posts are wholeheartedly behind the principle of the Government—your Government and mine—providing \$5,000 insurance to the

boys that enter the armed services, free coverage in case they give the supreme sacrifice and lay down their lives, so that their families may have something on which to live; in other words, that their dependents, if you please, may continue to live as they are supposed to live—the father, the mother, or perhaps the wife and children of the man who willingly gave his life for his country. I want to compliment my Legion posts for their unselfishness in urging that the young men of the present war receive free insurance to the extent of \$5,000, even though they, the veterans of the war of 1917, were not so favored.

I read, Mr. Chairman, from a few of these letters as follows. The first one is from Dr. W. W. Larsen, a dentist at Starbuck, Minn., service officer of American Legion Post, No. 325:

A reading of H. R. 6512 at our Legion meeting last Thursday evening brought a unanimous vote for it. It seems a sensible solution for a neglected problem.

Now listen to this:

We have buried two draftees. The last one, of a destitute family, was buried by the county, a \$60 burial.

What do you think of that? Calling these boys into the service and then the county must bury them if they die just because they did not happen to carry insurance.

To continue Dr. Larsen's letter:

Had an honorable discharge. Got an infection while in service, spent 5 weeks in Walter Reed Hospital, had leg amputated, was sent home to die, which he did a month later. I called the Veterans' Administration in Minneapolis, but they said no provision had as yet been made for this soldier to be buried by the Government, so the county did it.

Is this, Members of the House, our American way of taking care of our service men and women?

Look into your souls and search for the truth. Do you not think that insurance on our people in the service should be automatic upon entrance, compulsory, and paid for by the Government, by the people these boys are willing to die for, to the amount of \$3.35 premiums per month?

Can we ask these men to go to the swamps of Burma, the jungles of India, the desert heat of Libya, the stinging cold of Alaska, without giving them the assurance that their wives and children will not suffer physically from the want of bare necessities of life if the worst happens? I ask you again, "Look into your souls."

At this point I wish to insert certain portions of the letters from the Legion posts and from which I have read to you Members today:

STARBUCK, MINN., February 14, 1942.

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A reading of H. R. 6512 at our Legion meeting last Thursday evening brought a unanimous vote for it. It seems a sensible solution for a neglected problem.

We have buried two draftees; the last one, of a destitute family, was buried by the county—a \$60 burial. Had an honorable discharge. Got an infection while in service,

spent 5 weeks in Walter Reed Hospital, had leg amputated, was sent home to die, which he did a month later. I called the Veterans' Administration in Minneapolis, but they said no provision had as yet been made for this soldier to be buried by the Government, so the county did it.

Your bill would have made it different for this family. More power to you.

Very truly yours,

W. W. LARSEN,
Service Officer,
American Legion Post, No. 325.

SANBORN STATE BANK,
Sanborn, Minn., February 26, 1942.
Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: At the last meeting of Colburn Post, No. 286, Sanborn, Minn., H. R. 6512, introduced by you, received the unanimous endorsement of the post, and I was instructed to convey this information to you.

Yours truly,

W. D. YAEGER,
Treasurer, Colburn Post, No. 286.

OSCAR LEE POST, No. 177,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Dawson, Minn., February 20, 1942.
Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you very much for the bulletins on veterans' benefits, also a copy of your bill, H. R. 6512, which we feel should be enacted into law at once. Though the veterans of World War No. 1 realize that our boys in the service today are much better provided for than we were, the best is none too good for them, so it is our earnest desire that any legislation of benefit to them should receive special consideration. The members of Oscar Lee Post, No. 177, appreciate your interest in veterans' affairs and wish you success in your efforts to have H. R. 6512 passed.

Sincerely yours,

S. E. GREENE,
Adjutant.

KENDALL P. STONE POST, No. 237,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Balaton, Minn., March 14, 1942.
Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. ANDERSEN: At the March 3, 1942, meeting of the above-named Legion post the membership voted unanimously to endorse H. R. 6512.

Yours truly,

FLOYD PARROTT,
Adjutant.

KANTHAK-MATTHIES POST, No. 441,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Bellingham, Minn., March 30, 1942.
Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have discussed your bill providing insurance in the amount of \$5,000 to all persons in the active armed forces of the United States with premiums to be paid by the Government during active service.

We favor passage of this bill.

We believe that the men of the ranks are underpaid and believe that any relief of the situation you can provide either by increased pay, gratuities, or both is very much to be desired and has our support.

Yours truly,

ARTHUR J. GLOEGE,
Adjutant.

GARVIN, MINN., March 10, 1942.
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Tyler, Minn.

DEAR FRIEND: Post No. 273 of Garvin is all for this bill. It would be a nice thing for the boys in service. Hope that they get it.
Yours truly,

CARL NYQUIST.

CITY OF MORRIS, MINN.,
February 11, 1942.

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress,
Seventh District, Minnesota.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: At our Legion meeting last night we endorsed your bill, H. R. 6512, with our entire membership of 210, and trust that you will have little difficulty in having it passed.

Very truly yours,

J. A. MIELKE.

SANBORN SENTINEL,
Sanborn, Minn., February 12, 1942.
Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Seventh Congressional District, Minn.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A copy of your recent bill, H. R. 6512, relative to an insurance policy for all present service men was read at our last Commercial Club meeting and, to say the least, it met with the unanimous favor of the membership.

A motion was made, seconded, and carried that the secretary write you of this vote of confidence and to extend the club's full endorsement of such good legislation. It is their hope that you will succeed in its ultimate passage and that it will meet with the approval of both houses of our Government for enactment.

Yours truly,

F. H. HARDER,
Secretary, Sanborn Commercial Club.

GRANITE FALLS POST NO. 69,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Granite Falls, Minn., February 11, 1942.
Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSEN: Enclosed please find copy of a resolution passed by our local post No. 69 of the American Legion in support of H. R. 6512 which you have introduced before Congress.

Very truly yours,

R. A. BERG, Adjutant.

"Whereas H. R. 6512 provides for payment by the United States Government of premiums on wartime insurance on the lives of men in the military forces of the United States of America: Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Granite Falls Post No. 69 of the American Legion does hereby endorse and recommend the immediate passage of said bill; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

"Dated, February 9, 1942.

"GRANITE FALLS POST NO. 69,
AMERICAN LEGION,

"By G. B. LARSON, Commander.

Attest:

"R. A. BERG, Adjutant."

RALPH M. SPINK POST NO. 97,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Ortonville, Minn., February 10, 1942.
Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congressman From the Seventh District,
Minnesota, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: Received your letter a short time ago in regards to your bill H. R. 6512. At our post meeting last evening I read this letter to the post members and there was a motion passed instructing me to write you as follows:

"That the Ralph M. Spink Post No. 97, Department of Minnesota, go on record as favoring H. R. 6512, but that it should be made retroactive as of December 7, 1941, that being the date of the beginning of the war, unless the men that were in the service on that date were otherwise provided for."

The members of our post expressed the feeling that due to the fact that the boys in actual service receive very little pay compared to people in defense work or private employment, they should be entitled to this extra security, and urged the passage of this bill.

Very truly yours,

J. A. JACOBSON,
Post Adjutant, City Clerk.

LEE-OSBORN POST, NO. 59,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Montevideo, Minn., February 24, 1942.

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Lee-Osborn Post, No. 59, American Legion, Montevideo, Minn., endorses your bill, H. R. 6512, in its entirety, and the post extends their appreciation and commend you for introducing this legislation.

With best wishes for your continued good health and success.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,
LEE-OSBORN POST, NO. 59,
S. S. MICHAELSON, Adjutant.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
J. BEN JOHNSON POST, NO. 169,
Clarkfield, Minn., February 20, 1942.

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The members of American Legion Post, No. 169, Clarkfield, Minn., have gone on record registering their approval and are very much in favor of bill H. R. 6512, which you have introduced, and we will welcome same to become law.

Very truly yours,

C. O. LILLJESTRALE,
Adjutant.

Mr. Chairman, it has been brought up here that this is going to cost the Government an awful lot of money if we have a million casualties. Naturally it is going to cost the Government money if we have a million casualties. This war is going to cost us money. It is going to cost us two hundred or two hundred and fifty billion dollars or more. Can we not spend \$20,000,000,000 to take care of the dependents of those killed in action or to take care of the boys themselves when they are totally disabled? You all know we passed an act giving free coverage for property destroyed by bombings and war action. Are not the lives of these men as precious as property? Oh, yes; it will cost money to win this war. We will win it, but let us take care of the dependents of the boys, men, and women who will give up their lives by the hundreds of thousands to assure us victory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has just read several letters from posts of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars in the gentleman's congressional district. Has he received any letter from

any of these veterans' organizations which opposes the amendment the gentleman proposes to offer?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have not received a single letter in opposition thereto. I would like at this time to quote a sentence from a letter received from the legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

Personally, I favor the purpose of your bill, but cannot permit my personal convictions to speak for our entire organization.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman's amendment provide for the payment of a premium by the Government or by the soldier?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My amendment provides for automatically covering these boys or women when they go into the service to the extent of \$5,000. The Government takes care of that premium, which is \$3.35 per month at the present cost.

Mr. DONDERO. The Government pays the premium under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. The cost of the gentleman's plan would be far in excess of \$3.50. It would be more like \$20.50.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I disagree with the gentleman. Suppose that only 90 percent of the boys who are in the service under the present voluntary system take out this insurance, and 10 percent do not for some reason or another, are you going to say to this 10 percent or to their dependents that just because they did not know enough to do so, they cannot receive benefits from the Nation they fought to save? Or are you going to say to the dependents, the fathers and mothers, wives and children, the dependents of this 10 percent—or portion thereof who were killed—"No, just because he did not sign an application you are not eligible. You have no cause to receive insurance payments even though your neighbor may?"

I do not think that is what the House intends to do. It may cost \$25,000,000,000 if enough of our boys are slaughtered and we know we are in a war of survival, but Mr. Chairman, if these boys are slaughtered—if they do give their lives that we may live—are we not going to pay the bill anyway, regardless of whether or not they pay this puny \$3.50 per month or make application for insurance? What better can we do for the service man than to try to see to it that his loved ones back home are taken care of should he pass to the great beyond?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this Act may be cited as the Emergency Family Allowance Act of 1942.

TITLE I—FAMILY ALLOWANCES

SEC. 101. On and after the first day of the fourth calendar month following the date of

enactment of this act, and during a period of war formally recognized by Congress, and for a period of 6 months after such war shall have ceased to exist, the dependents of each enlisted man of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grade of the Army of the United States, United States Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including any and all retired and reserve components of said services, in the active military or naval service of the United States shall be entitled to monthly family allowances as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 102. (a) A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States upon written application to the department concerned by any enlisted man having a dependent or dependents or by or on behalf of any dependent of any enlisted man in accordance with and subject to the conditions, limitations, and exceptions hereinafter provided.

(b) For the purpose of facilitating the administration of this title, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may, by regulations, prescribe the dates of commencement and termination of allowances and reductions provided herein: *Provided*, That such dates of commencement and termination shall not vary by more than 1 month from the dates prescribed in section 102 (c) hereof: *And provided further*, That no family allowance shall be paid for any period preceding the effective date of this title, as provided in section 101 hereof.

(c) The monthly family allowance shall be paid from the date of filing of application therefor to include the month of notice of change in status, discharge from, or death in the service, but not for more than 6 months after the war shall have ceased to exist, and shall be for the purpose and, subject to the provisions of section 103, in amounts stated, as follows:

Class A. In the case of a man to his wife and to his child or children—

- (1) if there be a wife but no child, \$20;
- (2) if there be a wife and one child, \$30, with \$10 per month additional for each additional child;
- (3) if there be no wife but one child, \$15;
- (4) if there be no wife but two children, \$25, with \$10 per month additional for each additional child; and
- (5) a former wife divorced to whom alimony has been decreed, \$20.

Class B. In the case of a man to a dependent parent, or a disabled and dependent brother or sister—

- (1) if there be one dependent parent, \$15;
- (2) if there be two dependent parents, \$25; and
- (3) for each disabled and dependent brother or sister, \$5.

(d) Allowances shall be paid to such persons of the above classes as the enlisted man may designate, or on their behalf. In the absence of an application by the enlisted man, when a relationship of dependency as provided in subsection (c) of section 102 hereof is found in fact to exist, authorized payments may be made to the dependents as prescribed by section 209 of this act, whichever is appropriate.

(e) The family allowances to members of class B shall be subject to each of the following conditions:

(1) The family allowance to members of class B dependents shall be granted only if and while the member is, in fact, dependent upon the enlisted man for chief support, as determined upon applicable regulations, and then only if and while the enlisted man requests that such family allowance be paid, except that in cases where it is determined by the head of the department concerned, or by such subordinate as he may designate, that it is impracticable for the enlisted man to request the payment of a monthly family allowance as herein provided the head of such department, or such person as he may designate, is authorized, upon application of the

person of the relationship specified in class B for the family allowance, to direct the payment of the monthly family allowance.

(2) The total allowance to be paid to the beneficiaries of class B shall not exceed the sum of \$50 per month.

(3) Where the total amount of allowances computed under section 102 (c) of this title to members of class B exceeds \$50 per month, the family allowance shall be reduced in such amounts and apportioned as between the members of class B as may be prescribed by regulation.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON:

On page 3, line 8, strike out "\$20" and insert in lieu thereof "28."

On page 3, line 9, strike out "\$30" and insert in lieu thereof "\$40."

On page 3, line 11, strike out "\$15" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20."

On page 3, line 12, strike out "\$25" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON: On page 3, line 25, strike out "of" and insert "or."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNES: On page 2, line 11, after "a" strike out "dependent or dependents" and insert "wife, or wife and child, or children."

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to clarify the language of the section. From the debate today it is obvious that many Members are confused as to whether or not the soldier or sailor could make an allotment to his wife and children, or wife and child, or to his wife regardless of whether the wife or children were dependent on him. This will clarify the language so that the enlisted man could make an allotment to his wife, or wife and child, or wife and children, regardless of dependency. If the enlisted man does not elect to make a written application for the allotment, then the wife or the children will have to prove that they are actually dependent on the soldier. I believe that is the way the legislation was intended to be drafted originally.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: On page 1, line 6, strike out "fourth" and insert "second."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad indeed to have an opportunity to speak in support of the allotment bill (H. R. 7119) for the relief of the dependent wives, children, parents, brothers, and sisters of our soldiers and sailors. I understand from

our able and distinguished friends the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON] that the fact of a marriage of a soldier or sailor creates dependency on the part of his wife and their children. I was inclined to think, under section 102 of the bill, as drawn, that the wife and children had to be dependent in fact.

Mr. HARNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to hear from the gentleman from Texas or the author of the bill the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON].

Mr. THOMASON. I would say in answer to the gentleman that certainly it is presumed and assumed that there is dependency; but frankly, under class A, it is the relationship that establishes the marriage relationship, and certainly we cannot set up in this bill just what individual instances will be covered. It is a question of whether or not a woman is a man's legal wife.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is just what I wanted to get to. Section 102 (a) says:

A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States upon written application to the department concerned by any enlisted man having a dependent or dependents or by or on behalf of any dependent of any enlisted man in accordance with and subject to the conditions, limitations, and exceptions hereinafter provided.

The wife and children are entitled to support from the husband and father, and I think it is a good policy to assume that the wife and children are dependent. I was wondering if the poor husband of a millionaire wife would have to contribute to her support while he is in the service, or if he would have to contribute to a wife who had proved to be untrue and leading a dissolute life while her husband was in the service.

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. HARNES. I believe the gentleman is mistaken when he says that the millionaire wife of a soldier could draw this money regardless of whether the soldier made an allotment. She could not get it unless the soldier volunteered to make an allotment to her or unless she could prove that she was dependent.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There is another matter that has been raised here, and I hope some amendment will be offered to correct it if the administrative agency does not have the power to regulate this. For instance, where parents have 3 or 4 sons in the Army, who is going to make the contribution? Should it not be so arranged that each son contribute his proportional part of the \$22? I know of 1 father and mother in my district, and they are not very well to do, who have 5 sons in the service. It has been reported to me recently that another father and mother have 9 sons in the service. If this is true, no doubt this is the record in the United States. I have the honor, however, of representing a great, patriotic, fighting people.

Perhaps 90 percent of the people in my district were not in favor of getting into the war; but since we are in, they are united and determined to win and help to destroy forever the power and influence of the Axis and the war lords of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Mr. Chairman, I have received a great many letters from dependent wives, children, and parents of our soldiers and sailors. The bill provides that nothing can be paid until 4 months after the passage of this act. The war has been going on 6 months, and if this 4-month provision remains in the bill, it will be October before any relief can come to the dependent wives, children, and parents covered by this bill. I have offered an amendment to reduce this 4 months to 2 months. I realize it will require some time to set up the necessary organization and personnel to handle these claims. This ought to be done in 2 months. We have, according to the records, 160,000 soldiers and sailors now in the service who have dependents.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I am in sympathy with the worthy objective of the gentleman's amendment. It seems to me this resolves itself into a practical proposition. I am inclined to the belief that 4 months is too long, but the War Department and the Navy Department have said that they must have a reasonable time in which to set up the machinery and the accounting system to carry this act into effect. It seems to me that on the whole the gentleman's amendment is very fair. As far as I am personally concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] who has charge of this bill for the acceptance of my amendment. Now the payments can begin after 2 months from the passage of this act. This will bring relief likely to 200,000 or more dependents of soldiers and sailors 2 months earlier than it would otherwise have been under the bill.

News came to the floor of the House a few moments ago that the Senate had voted 58 to 20 instructing its conferees to agree to the \$50 a month entrance or base pay for our soldiers and sailors as provided in the bill we passed in the House. This means, of course, that the measure will now go through promptly providing for the base or entrance pay of \$50 per month for our soldiers and sailors, \$54 per month for first class privates, \$66 for corporals, and increases for sergeants up to the highest rank of sergeants and petty naval officers of \$138 per month and also an increase for second lieutenants. This action is very, very pleasing, indeed, to me.

THE BILL PROVIDES

I thank the Military Affairs Committee for agreeing to the increases provided for in the Senate bill. The following table indicates the amounts payable in the most typical cases which also shows the contribution made by the Government and the contribution

made by the soldier or sailor and the total amount that will be received:

	Government contribution	From soldier's pay	Total
To class A:			
Wife, if no child.....	\$28	\$22	\$50
Wife with 1 child.....	40	22	62
Wife with 2 children.....	50	22	72
To class B if there is no class A dependent:			
1 parent.....	15	22	37
2 parents.....	25	22	47
1 parent and 1 sister.....	20	22	42
1 parent and 2 sisters.....	25	22	47
To class B if there is also a class A dependent:			
1 parent.....	15	5	20
2 parents.....	25	5	30
1 parent and 1 sister.....	20	5	25
1 parent and 2 sisters.....	25	5	30

In other words, the Government will pay to the wife with no child \$28 and the soldier will contribute \$22, making a total of \$50 a month.

A wife with one child will receive \$40 from the Government and \$22 from the soldier or sailor, making \$62 a month in all.

A wife with two children will receive \$50 from the Government and \$22 from the soldier, making \$72 a month in all.

Where there is more than one child, each child will be allowed an additional \$10 a month.

Wife and children belonging to class A dependents and the contribution by the soldier or sailor is obligatory. If there are parents, brothers or sisters, and no class A dependents, the soldier will still make contribution of \$22 per month but, as I understand it, this is voluntary on his part.

One parent will receive \$15 a month from the Government, two parents \$25 a month. One parent and one sister, \$20 a month; one parent and two sisters, \$25 a month. These sums will be added to the contribution made by the soldier.

If there are class B and also class A dependents, the parents and the sisters will receive the same from the Government but the soldier's contribution will only be \$5 a month and it, too, will be voluntary. Contributions by service men are purely voluntary as to parents, brothers, sisters.

The word "child" includes an adopted child and an illegitimate child of the service man, if it has been so adjudged by the courts or the father has sworn to the child. The bills include stepmother or stepfather or foster parents.

There is no limit as to the number of children of the service man for which the Government will pay \$10 a month.

There is a limit of \$50 Government contribution to class B dependents.

I am very happy indeed that the Congress has given substantial increases to our gallant defenders and is making reasonable provision for their dependents. Congress has already passed measures that will provide benefits for those who are wounded or whose health is impaired and care for the widows, and orphans, and dependent parents of those who give their lives in defense of our country and to win the great war in which we are engaged.

There are those who complain about these measures. We are giving billions of dollars in war equipment, supplies, and in money to other countries. Our soldiers and sailors leave their homes, their families, relatives and friends, also opportunities to make money, to go to school and prepare for their future. In my opinion we cannot do too much for them or their dependent wives, children, parents, and we should not neglect those who went forth and heroically fought and won our other war and defended our country through the years or their dependents.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to. Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 3, line 20, strike out "disabled and."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the bill proposes benefits for dependent brothers or sisters if they are disabled. The purpose of my amendment is to make a dependent sister or brother eligible for \$5 per month without requiring that they be disabled. It seems to me that if the fact of dependency exists it should not also be required that they be disabled.

While I was home recently there was a funeral for a parent of some boys who are in the service. In the family are some minor brothers and sisters. The boys now in the service have become the sole support of that family, so dependency would clearly exist. It seems to me that with dependency existing there is no justification for requiring disability. Therefore, I suggest the adoption of the amendment.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The language with reference to disabled and dependent brothers and sisters would include minors because they are under a legal disability.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the case cited, that might cover the situation, but in others it might not, and my amendment is to strike out the requirement of disability and leave simply the question of dependency to be established.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Your minors would be included under the law as it is written here and they would get the allotment.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. May I say to the gentleman that I think the language in the printed bill is too restricted and I am very glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield. Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Would not the gentleman also wish to strike out

the same words in line 17 as well as in line 20?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; and if the pending amendment should be adopted, I will ask to have that done.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

During the formulation of the bill the committee gave careful consideration to this particular phase of the problem. It should be pointed out here that the scope of the measure as offered by the committee has been determined very largely upon the past experience of the Veterans' Administration and the suggestions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, and Assistant Administrator in charge of finance and insurance, Mr. Harold W. Breining.

It was pointed out that similar provision for class B dependents was made during the last war and that as a result it took the Veterans' Bureau until 1925 to clear those claims after the war. There were many difficulties in determining dependency in those groups of class B relatives. As a matter of fact, they were never fully determined. The matter was finally disposed of by an act of Congress which authorized validation of payment simply upon the basis of relationship.

The present measure provides for wives, children, and dependent parents. It also goes beyond to provide for disabled and dependent brothers and sisters. If this amendment is adopted, it will open the door for thousands upon thousands of claims which will arise following the war. This will impose a tremendous and confusing burden upon the Veterans' Administration, for there are almost as many different definitions of dependency as there are claims of dependency. I think it would be extremely unwise and shortsighted to broaden this provision in the manner contemplated by this amendment, in view of all the actual experience with dependents' claims which advises against it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, the gentleman recalls that the soldiers' pay itself would also have a reduction of \$5, and, therefore, it would amount to \$10.

Mr. HARNESS. That is right, but I think we ought to limit it to the fewest persons we can, thereby eliminating, after the war is over, this trouble we had before. I believe we should follow the recommendation of the Veterans' Administration that has handled these matters.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELSTON. May I ask the gentleman if the amendment should prevail, is it not a fact that you would impose upon both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy a considerable amount of work to determine whether or not dependency existed as to countless brothers

and sisters who might make such application?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will permit, that certainly would not impose any additional burden on the Army or the Navy because the language as it exists in the bill requires the determination of dependency, and this would relieve the additional burden of determining disability.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. I notice this allowance is to be granted on the application of the enlisted man. Are there any special provisions in the bill in reference to the men who are now out of the country?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; that is fully covered. Men in the foreign field service are fully protected, because an application may be made for and in their behalf.

Mr. COCHRAN. The only reason I ask this is that I happen to remember the administration of the Allotment Act during the last war. Our men were in France, were in the trenches, and were very active at the time. Before the administrators of the law would pay 5 cents to any wife or mother or any other dependent, they demanded that the application be signed by the man who was in the trenches. They sent the papers to France to the men on the firing line, and had them fill out and sign the papers. Remember, not a dime was paid to those dependents until that was done, and many of them were on the verge of destitution.

I express the hope that there is some kind of a provision in this bill that will not require these men in the various parts of the world, and God knows they are in all parts of the world from what we hear, to have to go through that process. Undoubtedly we will make some mistakes paying money that should not be paid; but if it cannot be recovered, we can make provisions by law to take care of such payments as we did during the World War; but I would rather do that than deprive immediate aid to those who are in need of the aid.

Mr. COSTELLO. The application may be made by any soldier or any dependent of a soldier. So that if the soldier is disabled or is unable to make application the dependents may make application here.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is what I want to bring out, as I knew it was there. I am talking now for the benefit of those who will administer the act. I do not want them to think when the application is filed by a dependent, Congress expects them to wait before they pay until the soldier approves. If you accept the application of the dependents, especially the wife or the mother, then they should go ahead and pay. It takes 50 or 60 days for a transport to go over to Australia or some other place in the Far East and 120 days at least to get the papers back

here, so we are providing for immediate payments in this bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. I refer the gentleman to the language on page 2 of the bill, section 102 (a):

SEC. 102. (a) A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States upon written application to the department concerned by any enlisted man having a dependent or dependents or by or on behalf of any dependent of any enlisted man in accordance with and subject to the conditions, limitations, and exceptions hereinafter provided.

In other words, the application is to be made by the soldier or his dependents.

But in the case of class B, if the dependent applies for an allowance, and it is made, the soldier has the right to stop that, if he does not want it to be made, but the soldier could not cut off a class A dependent.

Mr. COCHRAN. Now let this be known. It is the intent of the Congress in passing this act to notify the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, that we want this money paid without unnecessary delay and not handled like it was in the World War. Let them take notice of that when they administer the law, not to delay payments over a period of many months. Thousands never did receive their allotments until after the World War was over. That is a fact.

Mr. THOMASON. We specifically provide that the payments shall bear the date of application, and it is also provided that if the soldier cannot make application, the same can be made by dependents.

Mr. BROOKS. And in line with that, I call attention to the bottom of page 3, subparagraph (d):

Allowances shall be paid to such persons of the above classes as the enlisted man may designate, or on their behalf. In the absence of an application by the enlisted man, when a relationship of dependency as provided in subsection (c) of section 102 hereof is found in fact to exist, authorized payments may be paid to dependents or as prescribed by section 209 of this act, whichever is appropriate.

Mr. COCHRAN. The point I make is that it is going to take 5 months to get an application to the Far East and back, and I want to impress on the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard now, it is the intent of the Congress to pay the dependents just as soon as possible after the passage of the act. If I am in error then let someone say so now. There being no correction I take it our intent is made plain to those who administer the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 103. (a) The pay of any enlisted man of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grade, in the active military or naval service of the United States, having a class A or a class B dependent or dependents as defined in section 102 (c) with respect to whom the head of the department concerned has determined that a monthly allowance is payable, shall be reduced by, or charged with, the amount of \$20 per month: *Provided*, That where

monthly family allowances are to be paid to both class A and class B dependents an additional reduction of \$5 per month to be paid to class B dependents shall be made: *Provided further*, That the amount of the reduction in the monthly pay, together with the family allowance to be paid to a wife or a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or written agreement, or to a former wife divorced, shall not exceed the amount specified to be paid to such person in the court order, decree, or written agreement; and the amount of the reduction in monthly pay and the family allowance shall be adjusted and apportioned for this purpose as may be prescribed by regulation.

(b) The family allowances provided in section 102 (c) shall be increased by an amount equivalent to the reduction in, or charge to, pay required by this section, distributed among the beneficiaries in such manner as may be prescribed by regulation.

(c) In cases where an allotment in favor of a dependent who is a member of class A or class B as defined in section 102 (c), or in favor of any other allottee, is already in effect, such allotment shall, in accordance with regulations of the head of the department concerned, be modified or continued in order to achieve the purposes of this title.

(d) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as modifying the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.).

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON: Page 5, line 9, strike out "\$20" and insert in lieu thereof "\$22."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a corrective amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON: Page 5, line 14, after the word "pay" strike out the comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: Page 5, line 22, after the word "regulation," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add: "Provided further, That any enlisted man may elect to have his pay reduced by or charged with a lesser amount than \$22 and in such case the amount to be paid by the Government of the United States shall be proportionately reduced."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the intent of my amendment is merely this: That the soldier or sailor does not have to elect to have his own salary reduced by \$22 to come under this bill, but that he may elect to give his dependents a lesser amount than \$22, and in such case the amount that the Government shall pay to those dependents shall be proportionately reduced.

I have in mind certain cases where perhaps no claim of dependency was even made before the selective service board, yet as a matter of justice and fairness those dependents should receive something. Under my amendment the man in the service could elect to have his own pay reduced by \$10, the Government's

contribution added to that, and it would be paid to his mother or father or other dependents. This will also take care of those cases where perhaps there are two or three boys in the service from the same family, and each one of those boys wants to have a part in providing for his parents or other dependents.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Is the gentleman making his amendment apply to both class A and class B dependents?

Mr. CURTIS. I think as I have it prepared, perhaps it would. What I had in mind more particularly was the class B dependents.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman's amendment, as I understood it, applied to both class A and class B dependents. If the gentleman's amendment should prevail would you not in effect destroy the very purpose desired by this bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I think not.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Would not the gentleman's amendment include the case of a man who went into the service and for no reason at all except ill feeling toward his wife or a desire to neglect his children, decided he did not want to pay more than \$1 a month, and that is all he would have to pay?

Mr. CURTIS. I think not.

Mr. ELSTON. The way the gentleman's amendment reads, he could allot whatever amount he saw fit.

Mr. CURTIS. At the present time he does not have to allot anything.

Mr. ELSTON. At the present time it is mandatory that \$22 be allotted as to class A dependents.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Your amendment, as I understand it, would permit the soldier to suggest an allotment to a person who was not wholly dependent. Is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. Not necessarily.

Mr. BROOKS. But he could do it, could he not?

Mr. CURTIS. No. It does not waive any of the rules of dependency laid down in this bill.

Mr. BROOKS. But I understood the gentleman to say in cases of partial dependency or in cases where there were several brothers, one of whom might be taking care of the dependents, he could still make an allotment although there were no dependents. Is that right?

Mr. CURTIS. I think not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think if the gentleman would break his amendment into two separate amendments he would get what he wants to get at.

The gentleman wants to do certain other things under class B. I certainly would not want to go along with the gen-

tleman's amendment the way it is written because it sets up a conflict in that it cuts across both A and B.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe there is no conflict.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is not adopted. Some very nice compliments have been paid to the committee concerning this bill. It seems to me the amendment would absolutely disrupt the entire program.

The provisions must be uniform if the bill is going to be effective. You cannot leave it up to a soldier to say, "I want to give but \$5 of my \$22 to a certain relative." To do that would be to distinguish between men in the service with some forced to contribute \$22 and others not. It seems apparent the soldiers are going to get \$50 a month base pay. This would leave \$28 to the soldier for his personal needs. He, of course, gets free food, clothing, housing, and some other things; so this amendment would be very damaging to this bill.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. If this amendment should be adopted would it not greatly impede the efforts of the selective service boards in selecting men for military service?

Mr. THOMASON. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. ELSTON. If this bill should pass, the Selective Service Director and the draft boards would know definitely how much money a family would have for their support while the soldier or the sailor is in the service; but if this amendment should be adopted they would not know whether a man's family, his wife or children or other dependents, would be taken care of at all.

Mr. THOMASON. I thank the gentleman. I repeat, it would be most confusing if the amendment were adopted.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. It would simply multiply the amount of bookkeeping, addition and calculations in all of the boards that handle this matter. In the case of partial dependency referred to by the gentleman who just spoke there would be the question of whether there was dependency at all. Bringing in the question of partial dependency nullifies the whole thing.

Mr. THOMASON. If a soldier who has a dependent wife is not willing to contribute \$22 when the Government contributes \$28, he is not entitled to an allotment.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Is it not possible that in the case of partial dependency set forth by the gentleman from Nebraska, the dependent should return some part of what he received?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; if his conscience hurts him, he can hand it back.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I want to ask a question that is bothering some of us back here: Whether or not under this bill you can pay a wife and children of an existing marriage and also pay former wives and their children.

Mr. THOMASON. As long as they are children they will all receive the amount provided for in this bill.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: Line 9, page 5, strike out the words "the amount of" and insert "an amount equal to the allowances provided in section 102 (c) but not to exceed."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have it again reported. I cannot speak for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Pace amendment.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, as I explained during the debate on the rule, as the bill is now amended it would require deduction from a soldier's pay of \$22 per month even though the Government is paying only \$5. In the case of a sister or brother the Government payment, is \$5, but as the bill is drawn no consideration is given to the amount the beneficiary is receiving.

The effect of my amendment would be that if a parent is drawing \$15 from the Government, a like amount would be deducted from the soldier's pay, thus matching the payment made by the Government. In the case of a sister, if the Government's payment is \$5, as the bill is drawn, the deduction from the soldier's pay would be \$22.

There are many instances, I am sure, where a soldier would want to help his sister and be willing to put up \$5 or \$10 to match a like amount paid by the Government, but he might hesitate at having \$22 deducted from his pay in order to get a \$5 contribution from the Government. That is the amendment, and I understood it was acceptable to the members of the committee. It is simply to provide that the total of \$22 will not be deducted unless comparable payment is made by the Government.

Mr. COSTELLO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. According to that, then, the gentleman is going to make some changes in the amount which persons are going to receive. I do not know whether this has been placed in the Record or not, but I believe it is taken from the Senate report on its bill. In the case

of the class B dependents, where there is only one parent, the Government contribution will be \$15. Under the language of the gentleman's amendment only \$15 will be deducted from the soldier's pay and, as a result, the parent will receive \$30?

Mr. PACE. That is right.

Mr. COSTELLO. Whereas under the present arrangement the parent would receive \$37, \$22 plus \$15. In the case where there is one parent and one sister, the payment would be \$20. There you would reduce it to \$40 instead of \$42.

Mr. PACE. At the same time I am sure the gentleman would not support a provision in the bill whereby a sister would get a contribution from the Government of \$5 and you require that the soldier have \$22 deducted from his pay?

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman will observe that is not the situation, because you run into the fact the Government contributes, plus the soldier's allotment, which gives the full amount.

Mr. PACE. I am quite sure the gentleman must agree, if he will think about it a moment, that that would cause many soldiers to decline to make contributions to a brother or sister, where the Government contribution was only \$5 and he would be required to put up \$22. Surely the gentleman from California would not argue in support of such a provision as that.

Mr. Chairman, every member of the committee I have talked with said that my amendment was the way the bill was intended to be drawn. The gentleman from California is the first member of the committee who has raised any question that it was the intention of the committee to require no greater payment from the soldier than the Government was putting up itself. Every member of the committee, including the chairman of the subcommittee, stood me down, as the fellow says, that that is what the bill does now. Unhappily it does not; and my amendment, I respectfully submit, provides what the members of the committee told me it was intended to do—that is, if a dependent received only \$5 the soldier should only be required to put up \$5. If the dependent received \$20, the soldier should put up the \$20. Certainly it was not intended by the committee, from their own declarations made to me, that the Government would put up \$5 and you would deduct \$22 from the pay of the soldier.

It seems simple justice to require no greater contribution from the soldier than the Government makes. In fact, under the amendments now adopted, if I correctly understand the situation, the Government is putting up \$28 and the soldier is putting up \$22. Here you have gone into reverse; the Government is putting up \$5 and the soldier is putting up \$22. Certainly it was not the intention of the committee, and it should not be the intention of the Congress, to do that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the gentleman offers in general would have little or no effect upon the proposal in this legislation. It would not change the amounts which are to be paid to the dependents, because in the majority of cases more than \$22 is actually to be paid out. The only exception to that which he singles out is where there would be only a brother or a sister as a dependent, and in that case the Government would only contribute to such brother \$5; however, if the soldier were to have his pay deducted only in the amount of \$5, it would mean that brother or sister would receive payment of \$10 per month.

Under the existing language of the bill, the Government would only give \$5 to such dependent brother, but the soldier would still contribute \$22, which would mean a total payment of \$27 to a brother or sister who is according to the language of the bill disabled or a dependent. As a result, the amendment here would cut down the allotment in that case to \$5 on the part of the soldier and \$5 on the part of the Government, a total of \$10. That is really the only particular case in which the gentleman's amendment would have any effect.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Why, it would have exactly the same effect on a man who has one parent. Under the bill as now drawn, the parent would get \$15 from the Government and \$22 from the soldier. My amendment would provide he would get \$15 from the Government and \$15 from the soldier.

Mr. COSTELLO. I agree with the gentleman on that illustration, the \$15 would be deducted from the soldier's pay for a parent. The only case in which the gentleman's amendment would have any effect is in the case of class B dependents, and the language of the bill makes it plainly mandatory that class B persons must be dependent. In the case of the class A group, dependency need not be shown. Under the class B group they must be dependent. The full effect of his amendment is where dependency is shown and proven, then the soldier is able to give less than the \$22 a month as an allotment from his pay.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman is making a very strong point. Let me ask him this question: If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia should prevail, then this dependent would be receiving only \$10 per month, is that correct?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the taxpayers must go into their pockets and make up the difference to bring that up to a subsistence level for the dependent?

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have already raised the salary and wages of the soldier who could make that contribution

himself. It seems to me that the amendment strikes at the very foundation of the increase in pay that we voted the other day.

Mr. COSTELLO. I think the gentleman is quite correct in his statement, because the primary purpose of that class B group is that you are making an allowance to them because of their dependency, yet we are going to make it possible for the soldier to make a contribution of less than the full amount in that particular case.

Actually, what we are requiring the soldier to do is to make an allotment of \$22 and, if there are both class A and class B dependents, we are asking the soldier then to make an additional allotment of \$5, so that the Government will not be called upon to pay out too large an amount where there are several dependents who would be receiving these allotments of pay.

I hope the amendment will be rejected. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 8, noes 34.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 6, lines 3 and 4, strike out "in such manner as may be prescribed by regulation" and insert "in the same ratio in which they share the allowances provided in section 102 (c), unless the enlisted man shall otherwise direct."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, on page 3 of the bill there are itemized the payments the Government makes—so much to the wife, so much to the child, and so much to the parent. Further on you provide that in such cases \$22 shall be deducted from the soldier's pay, but you make no provision in this bill as to how that \$22 shall be paid, to whom, or under what circumstances. You simply provide in the third and fourth lines on page 6 that it shall be distributed among the beneficiaries in such a manner as may be prescribed by regulation. That is, the Congress has not one word to say as to how the soldier's \$22 shall be paid and the soldier has not one word to say as to how his \$22 shall be paid.

I presume that this was detected in the Senate and it has been corrected in the Senate bill. The amendment which I now propose states that this \$22 which the soldier puts into the pot to match the \$28 the Government puts in shall be paid the same way, in the same proportion, or in the same ratio, as you set up on page 3, unless the soldier otherwise directs.

This is my reason for adding these last few words. Take the case of a soldier whose wife is an invalid and requires considerable medical care. The soldier may say, "I would like my wife to have my entire \$22." Say the soldier has two or three children, one of whom is an invalid. He may say, "I would like Johnny to have my \$22."

Certainly, either the Congress or the soldier, one or the other, should have

some voice in what you are going to do with his \$22, and not leave it entirely, as we have already done in so many bills passed by this Congress, subject merely to regulations issued by the head of some department. That is all you have in the bill at this moment, that the head of some department under a regulation that may be changed overnight can take the soldier's \$22 and pay it out as he pleases, to whomever he pleases. It is left entirely subject to regulations.

The Senate has corrected this error. You find in the Senate bill the language I have used, that is, that the soldier's \$22 shall be paid in the same ratio as are the payments made under section 102 (c), which you find on page 3.

I have added as my own language, which may be objectionable to the committee, "unless the soldier otherwise directs." As I say, that is in keeping with my view that in the absence of direction from the soldier, the wife, if she is alone, gets it all; if there is a wife and child, she gets two-thirds of it and the child gets one-third; and if there is a wife and two children, the wife gets one-half and the children get \$11 each.

Under the circumstances, certainly the man himself should have some right to say what shall be done with his own money. You are telling him what you will do with the Government's contribution, but he should be given some voice as to what to do with his \$22 that you take in order to match the Government's contribution.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. EDMISTON. I think the gentleman's amendment is good and sound. I think the man should have something to say as to what is done with the money he allots out of his pay. I feel that the War Department would administer it as the gentleman intends and feels it should be administered, and pay the money to those dependents who need it the most, but, personally, I cannot see any objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PACE. I thought that if there was any objection I would ask that the amendment be submitted in two parts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 104. As used in this title—

- (a) The term "wife" means a lawful wife.
- (b) The term "former wife divorced" means a former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed.
- (c) The term "child" includes—
 - (1) a legitimate child;
 - (2) a child legally adopted;
 - (3) a stepchild, if a member of the man's household, including a stepchild who continues as a member of the man's household after death of the mother or termination of the marriage; and
 - (4) an illegitimate child, but only if the man has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support, has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child; or, has acknowledged

under oath in writing, that he is the father of such child.

(d) The term "child" is limited to unmarried persons either (1) under 18 years of age, or (2) of any age, is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect.

(e) The term "parent" includes father and mother, grandfather and grandmother, stepfather and stepmother, father and mother through adoption, either of the person in the service or of the spouse, and persons who, for a period of not less than 1 year prior to a man's enlistment or induction, stood in loco parentis to the man concerned: *Provided*, That not more than two within those named herein may be designated to receive an allowance, and that where the designation is made by the head of the department as provided in section 102 (e) (1) preference shall be given to the parent, or parents not exceeding two, who actually exercised parental relationship at the time of or most nearly prior to the date of the enlisted man's entrance into active service: *Provided further*, That if such parent or parents be not dependent or waive an allowance, preference may be extended to others within the class who at a more remote time actually supported the enlisted man prior to entrance into service.

(f) The terms "brother" and "sister" include brothers and sisters of the half blood as well as those of the whole blood, stepbrothers and stepsisters, and brothers and sisters through adoption.

(g) The terms "pay" and "base pay" mean base pay and longevity pay, only.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: On page 6, line 19, after "decreed" strike out the period and insert "and is still payable."

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to make the language of this particular section conform to that which is in the Senate bill. Under the language here, the definition of a "former wife divorced" would be a former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed. I add the words "and is still payable," so that the court decree must not only have been made but must still be in effect at the time the payments are being made. I think it merely helps to clarify the language and make the bill more definite.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: On page 7, line 3, strike out "allegitimate" and insert "illegitimate." Line 5, after "support" strike out the comma and insert a semicolon.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, these are merely clarifying amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts: Page 7, line 8, after the word "child", strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "and (5) a

minor, if a member of the man's household, who is a brother or sister of the man and dependent upon him for support."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we treat as a beneficiary of this bill under the definition of "child" a man's adopted child. Now, like the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I know of situations where men have gone or are going into the service who have no children of their own, who have not adopted any children, and yet are bringing up their younger brothers and sisters. They are orphans and so are the little brothers and sisters, and the older brother has stood as the head of the family. He, of course, has not resorted to legal adoption and yet stands to those children in loco parentis. They are dependent upon him for support and at least have as much claim on him as a wife he might have adopted had he been minded so to do.

In this bill we treat as parents people who are not actually the parents of the soldier, but who have been standing for a period of time in loco parentis to the soldier. My amendment would simply mean that in a similar fashion we would treat as children those youngsters, brothers, and sisters of the enlisted man, to whom he has been standing in loco parentis.

This does not open the field wide to all claims from brothers and sisters of whatever age and wherever they may be. It is simply designed to protect those children who have made their homes with the man who is going into the service and who have been brought up by him and have had to look to him, even though he is only their older brother, in place of a father whom they have lost.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. COSTELLO. While I think there is considerable merit in what the gentleman has said, I question whether his amendment ought to go in at this particular place. Does the gentleman think it is a proper thing to offer in the bill as a definition of "child" minor brothers and sisters of the soldier? It seems to me the purpose which the gentleman wishes to accomplish could be accomplished some other way than trying to change the definition of the word "child" which the gentleman's amendment, of course, might do.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. It would simply include within the scope the particular people to whom a soldier stands in loco parentis.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The effect of putting in such brother or sister as a child and torturing the family relationship in

that way would mean that all brothers and sisters may be thrown into the A classification instead of the B classification.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Only those brothers and sisters who were being supported and brought up by the enlisted man and under age. I agree that it is a difficult thing to do, and I do not like to torture language any more than the gentleman from California, but I have not seen how the bill can conveniently be amended to accomplish this purpose except by these means.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 105. (a) The family allowance provided for in section 102 (c) shall continue to be paid irrespective of the pay status of the enlisted man concerned prior to the termination of his service as an enlisted man.

(b) In case of desertion or imprisonment the payment of the family allowance and the reduction in or charge against the pay of the individual provided for in this title shall be subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department concerned.

(c) For the purposes of this title an enlisted man of the military or naval forces shall be considered as in a pay status whenever entitled to be credited with pay and allowances under the provisions of the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public, No. 490, 77th Cong.).

SEC. 106. This title shall be administered by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy for personnel of their respective departments. They shall prescribe regulations necessary to effectuate the purposes of titles I and II of this act and make final and conclusive determinations in the administration thereof.

SEC. 107. The determination of all facts under the provisions of this title, including the fact of dependency shall be made by the head of the executive department concerned, or by such subordinate as he may designate, and such determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officer of the Government for all purposes: *Provided*, That any overpayments made by disbursing officers of the United States in carrying out the provisions of this title may be passed to their credit by the General Accounting Office in the audit of their accounts if it appears that such overpayments were made in the exercise of due and ordinary diligence, except that no such credit shall be passed when such overpayments are due to gross negligence, fraud, or criminality on the part of such disbursing officer.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 9, line 10, after the word "dependency", insert a comma, and in line 12, strike out the word "subordinate" and insert "subordinates"; also strike out the word "determination" and insert "determinations"; in line 13, strike out "officer" and insert "officers."

Mr. COSTELLO. That merely clarifies the language of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 108. The appropriations made to the department concerned for the payment of the pay of enlisted men shall be available for

the payment of the family allowances authorized herein.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 10, after line 2, insert the following as a new title:

"TITLE II

"SEC. 1. That all commissioned officers and enlisted men in the active military or naval service on April 20, 1942, and all persons hereafter entering upon active service during the present war shall be issued, without examination, national service life insurance in the amount of \$5,000 under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended: *Provided*, That while such persons continue in the active service, and for 6 months after separation from active service, or 6 months after the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, whichever is the earlier date, the premiums on such insurance shall be paid by the Government out of the current appropriations for pay and allowances pertaining to the particular organization under which the active service is performed: *Provided further*, That any person who has died in or been discharged from active service since April 19, 1942, and prior to the date of this enactment, and such death or discharge resulted from injury or disease incurred in line of duty, shall be deemed to have been granted \$5,000 national service life insurance effective as of April 20, 1942, or the date of entry upon active duty, whichever is the later date.

"SEC. 2. Upon termination of the period during which premiums are payable by the Government the insured shall have the option of continuing or converting the insurance issued under section 1 hereof, or any part thereof in any multiple of \$500 but not less than \$1,000, at his own expense: *Provided*, That during the period while premiums are payable by the Government, such insurance shall be continued as term insurance notwithstanding the provisions of section 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, except that during the period while premiums are payable by the Government, the \$5,000 insurance provided for in section 1 of this title, or any part thereof in any multiple of \$500 but not less than \$1,000, may be converted under the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, upon payment by the insured of the excess premium resulting from such conversion.

"SEC. 3. The issuance of \$5,000 insurance under section 1 shall not be construed to affect the right of any person otherwise eligible to apply for or carry additional insurance under the National Service Insurance Act of 1940, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, except that the aggregate amount of insurance carried under either or both such acts together with the \$5,000 insurance issued under section 1 hereof shall not at any one time exceed \$10,000.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title shall be for application under this act."

On page 10, line 3, strike out the numeral "II" and insert the numeral "III."

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas

for reserving his point of order, but at the same time I do not concede that the amendment is subject to the point of order. I think it is germane to this bill. I shall discuss that later after asking permission of the Chair to speak upon the point of order.

On December 20 last we passed the very same bill that I am asking the House today to adopt. My amendment simply takes off where that left, April 20, and continues to the men in the service the same provisions that you people here by unanimous consent gave on December 20. That simply provided that if any boy or man is killed in the service or permanently disabled, he is presumed, though he has not applied for life insurance, to be covered to the extent of \$5,000. This amendment has not been hastily conceived.

It has been worked out after deliberation with the Veterans' Administration. I do not claim that they have O. K.'d it, but neither have they rejected it. Yes; it is going to cost money, and as I stated before, are you not, you Members of the House, willing to do the same for the children and the wives and the fathers and mothers of these men who give up their lives that our Nation may live—are you not willing to give at least that same amount if necessary of money, billions it may be, as you have done in the lend-lease appropriations?

There are many places we can economize and we must economize but we cannot allow the dependents of our service men killed or disabled in action suffer because of these men performing their duty to our country.

That is simply the question before you. Some say that in case we lose a million men, the cost will be terrific. I reiterate what I stated before today. If we lose a million men or more, this Nation is going to see to it anyhow that the dependents of that million men, more or less, are going to be taken care of. So, in the name of common sense, why should we provide 2,000 stenographers to sit up here in some Government building, to write out these eight or ten million policies, which would be unnecessary under this amendment. This plan would be operated exactly as Public, No. 360 has operated from December 20 to April 20 on the basis of bookkeeping. Bookkeeping starts when the War and the Navy Department certifies to the National Service Life Insurance that a certain man has been killed or totally disabled. That is where the bookkeeping starts, rather than having no one knows how many women writing out policies, checking monthly collections from every unit in the services, and filling out forms without number. If you want to cut red tape, this will do it. Let us give to the service men's children this money instead of to unnecessary office workers.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One more point and I shall be glad to yield. I am asking you again, those of you who did not hear this letter which I received

from one of my Legion posts to listen to it while I read it again:

DEAR SIR: A reading of H. R. 6512 at our Legion meeting last Thursday evening brought out a unanimous vote for it. It seems a sensible solution for a neglected problem. We have buried two draftees, the last one of a destitute family was buried by the county, a \$60 burial. Had an honorable discharge. Got an infection while in service, spent 5 weeks in Walter Reed Hospital, had leg amputated, was sent home to die, which he did a month later. I called the Veterans' Administration at Minneapolis and they said no provision had as yet been made for this soldier to be buried by the Government so the county did it. Your bill would have made it different for this family. More power to you.

Dr. W. W. LARSEN,
Starbuck, Minn.

Oh, yes, it is going to cost money. I admit it. If we lose a million men it is going to cost just a lot of money. The question is here, and I repeat it, even if it did cost ten or fifteen billions, are you not willing to do just as much for the fathers and mothers and wives and children of these soldiers who will lay down their lives for our country that you have done in the form of lease-lend for foreign nations, for strangers?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order, that the amendment is not germane to this bill, because this is a bill to provide family allowance for dependents of enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States. The amendment which the gentleman is offering amends the National Life Insurance Act, so it seems to me it is apparent on its face that it is not germane. This amendment should be offered to the proper bill and at the proper time when it can have the full and fair consideration its importance deserves. This is an allowance and allotment bill and life insurance is not even referred to remotely.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, what has more to do with dependency in case these men do not come back than life insurance? After all, my particular amendment provides, Mr. Chairman, that such insurance shall be paid by the Government out of the current appropriations for pay and allowance, pertaining to the particular organization under which the active service is performed; the very same provision, Mr. Chairman, as is in this particular bill. I contend that this is germane. Certainly, if it is not germane there is nothing germane as far as the dependents of the service men is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BULWINKLE). The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] deals with national service life insurance, which is a creature of the Ways and Means Committee of the

House of Representatives. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota adds additional and different benefits to the allowances made under the proposed bill before the House.

On December 18, 1918, when the House was considering the bill H. R. 13366, authorizing the retention of the uniforms and personal equipment by discharged soldiers, Mr. Frank Mondell of Wyoming proposed an amendment as follows:

And all persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service shall receive 1 month's extra pay on discharge.

This amendment was held not to be germane to the bill under consideration. (Cannon's Precedents VIII, 2983.)

The Chair holds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is not germane, and therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. As used in this act the terms "man," "enlisted man," and "enlisted men," mean any enlisted individual of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grade, of any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this act while in active military or naval service of the United States.

SEC. 202. The provisions of this act shall not apply to members of the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan native guard and band of the Navy, and the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps.

SEC. 203. The Director of the Selective Service System shall cooperate with the head of the executive department concerned, or such subordinate as he may designate, to provide such information as may be required in the administration of this act.

SEC. 204. The family allowances, and assistance payable under this act, shall not be assignable; shall not be subject to the claims of creditors of any person to whom it is paid; shall not be liable to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatever, whether the same remains with the Government, or any officer or agent thereof, or is in the course of transmission to the beneficiary entitled thereto, but shall inure wholly to the benefit of such beneficiary.

SEC. 205. Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, family allowance, or assistance under this act, without being entitled thereto, with intent to defraud, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$2,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 206. Whoever in any claim for family allowance, or assistance, or in any document required by this act or by regulation made under this act, makes any statement of a material fact knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000, or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 207. If any person entitled to payment of family allowance or assistance under this act, whose right to such payment ceases upon the happening of any contingency, thereafter accepts any such payment with the intent to defraud, he shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 208. No part of any amount paid pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any claim arising under this act, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any

person violating this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000.

Sec. 209. When any payment under this act is to be made to a minor or to a person mentally or physically incompetent, such payment shall be made to the person who is constituted guardian or curator by the laws of the jurisdiction in which the beneficiary resides, or to the person who is legally or otherwise vested with the responsibility of care of the beneficiary as may be determined by the head of the department concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7119, to provide family allowances for the dependents of the enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 496, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H. R. 7119, as amended, just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill, H. R. 7119, was passed were vacated, and the bill H. R. 7119 was laid on the table.

READJUSTMENT OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, COAST GUARD, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the con-

ference report which I filed this morning on the bill S. 2025, to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an extract from speeches made by Mr. Sumner Welles, Mr. Steffanson, and Dr. Westphal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today upon the conclusion of other special orders I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A "LAME DUCK'S" REPORT TO CONGRESS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is a "lame duck's" report to Congress. A few days ago I left these Halls to go into Alabama for the purpose of attending my safe return to the Congress of the United States. Promptly on arrival there I launched my boat on the political waters and soon realized that my bark was being tossed on an unfriendly and stormy sea. The result was that I never made port. A new Congressman will be here next January, and may he serve well. Meanwhile, for the next 6 months I will be here. "Those also serve who only stand and wait." During that time I expect still to be the Representative of the district and I am going to do my best to represent it and shall do all I can to

help the man who defeated me. I do not blame him for making a "lame duck" of me. He comes here as I did 6 years ago representing the same people, quite as anxious, I am sure, to represent them well. Had the people of the district not felt they had proper cause they would never have voted me out, but we cannot afford too much of that over the country in this hour of national trial. Mr. Speaker, I think it is the patriotic duty of each of us who was defeated to do all in his power to prevent other Members of this Congress from suffering the same fate. No one man is indispensable, but every man lost from a war Congress weakens that Congress. The voters do not grasp the importance of holding a war Congress intact. I fear the press does not comprehend it. Through the past years they have been deciding congressional campaigns greatly on local and domestic issues, and they are not inclined to change even for a war program.

There is not a man in this Congress, Democrat or Republican, whom I would want to help defeat. I fear there is this danger for several good men, however. There is the danger that Congressmen whom the Nation can ill afford to lose may be lost from this Congress in this solemn hour of our Nation's peril. Can it be that we are unable to get it over to our people that men who have brought this program thus far are the proper ones to carry it on through this war? Is it possible that our contact is so weak or so remote that we are unable to make our people see that local issues or personal dislikes are dwarfed when a dangerous war is on our Nation? My voting record was never attacked, yet I was voted out of the next Congress.

We speak of a need for an understanding between different branches of labor and between employer and employee, but in the interest of national security and for the sake of popular understanding and confidence in this crucial hour we ought to have an understanding between the press of the United States and the Congress of the United States if that is possible to be reached. The manner in which the press reported and handled, for example, the social security bill, calling it a congressional pension bill, dealt this whole Congress a weakening blow. Every Member here who has opposition will lose votes because of that bill. I did not vote for the bill, as you know, but was charged by many voters with having done so. Even this would have done no injury had the press conveyed the facts so the bill could have been understood. There should be a mutual feeling of good will and understanding between the press and the Congress, certainly in these perilous days, such a feeling that that sort of thing could not occur. The public in my district was never given to know that the fund from which the so-called pension was to come was to have been money the Congressmen themselves paid.

They were always surprised when they were given the information. It is so hard to get facts to people on matters of that kind. There exists today much feeling over this, and it is one matter that cost many votes, thought I voted against it,

and though it was not a pension. An understanding between the press and the Congress would have prevented that injustice.

Other examples could be given, and I merely give this as one example. The Congress bears a tremendous responsibility to the people of the country, but so does our great free press. There should be a meeting of some kind between the Congress and the press, and it should come about quickly, and should be entered into seriously, unselfishly, and with patriotism as its aim. Of this there is no doubt. And there should be brought about by some means an understanding between the Congress and the people.

There is entirely too much distrust and skepticism in the minds of the populace toward this Congress. To blame the public is foolish. Congress must be able to blame itself, find the trouble, and find some way to overcome it. There must be some way to bring about among the people a feeling of trust and reliance toward this body, and this also should be done quickly, and the more quickly it is done, if it can be done, the better it will be for some who are sitting here today. Of that I have no doubt.

The people feel that vital information they are entitled to have is being withheld by this Congress. They do not know what it is, to be sure, but they are uneasy, and some even resentful.

Of course, I am giving you this as a report from my particular district, but my district is a representative one, and the experiences I have gone through and the facts I have found in my district will obtain, no doubt, in most districts throughout the United States, and it will be most vital to those of you who will have opposition between now and election time.

The vagueness of their unrest makes it all the more serious. Ask them what it is they wish to know and they will say, "You tell us." You will be talking to a crowd, and they will ask these vague questions. You will say, "Gentlemen, what is it you wish to know, what is your question?" And they say, "You tell us. Open the door. Congress is holding something back that we ought to know and we citizens of the United States are entitled to it." They continue in that darkened trend of thought. No door I was able to open seemed to throw any light on it. It is distant, it is hard to approach, and it leaves the Congressman at a disadvantage, while his opposition is at no disadvantage on that score.

When you go to your district they will confront you with questions and many of their questions will be very sharp and, by their nature, hard to answer.

Let me give you a few examples of these questions: "What about that agreement between Standard Oil and the German Chemical Trust?" I heard that a number of times. "What about Leon Henderson?" Now, how are you going to answer a question like that? "Is he not an agent of Congress and are you not a Member of Congress?" "What have you done for the small businessman?" It seems that there are so many small businessmen. "What about that congres-

sional pension you voted for yourself out of the taxpayer's money?" There go 20 minutes of your time taken up in answering that question right there, time that you can ill afford to spare from a restless people. "What about the Smith amendment against the workers of the country?" Oh, how often I heard that one, and I did vote for the Smith amendment.

"What about gasoline rationing against all of us while Congress has all the gas it wants, on the floor and off?" "Why did not Congress do something about heading off this rubber shortage?" They feel that Congress could have done something. I suppose there is a connection there with the Standard Oil matter. They keep talking about that. Many feel we ought to have enough foresight to look down the road and see what is coming and that we could have prepared this Nation so there would not be a rubber shortage.

"What about the lag and drag in Congress on preparedness and war legislation?" "Why have you not been around to see us?" And let me dwell a minute on that. Oh, how many times I heard that in the drug stores, on the street, in the filling station, and at the country store—everywhere. They asked, "Have you gone high hat, have you gone national? We have not seen you for 2 or 3 years." I said, "We have been tied to a desk, we have been at work, we have been trying to do something for that length of time. For 3 years straight we have been tied down in Congress." "Well," they said, "there is no law against you coming down to see us once in a while. We want to talk to you and tell you what to do. We want you to talk to us and tell us what you are doing."

In my district they have not forgiven me for not being more frequently seen down there, as the vote shows. I believe I heard that more than any other one thing, Mr. Speaker, and it is serious; it is one of the main reasons why I took this time to speak to the House today. If the Members of this Congress are coming back here in future years, and unless there is going to be a tremendous turnover each 2 years in the Congress of the United States, it is going to have to work out some way so that it can be here and do its business in 6 or 7 months and spend the remaining months of the year amongst the people. You cannot have your ear to the breast of your community and hear its beat if you are away. You need to know what your people are thinking about. It qualifies you to represent your district and keeps you from becoming a stranger. If they do not see and hear you, they are going to vote for somebody they do see and hear; that is what they are going to do. I am not blaming the man who beat me. He just had more campaigning sense than I did. As a matter of fact, he had the noses counted before I got there. I did not have a chance; I was licked before I got home.

Yet before when I would go down there they would ask, "Is not Congress in session? You get back on your job." And I would catch a plane and zoom right back up here—all at my own expense. No

doubt they think the trips home and back are borne by Mr. Taxpayer.

If Congress is held in session you cannot go home. They will condemn you for being down there, so the only way to do is to have Congress in vacation so that you can do it and keep face while you are home. That is one thing that helped retire me, not being around to see the folks and talk with them. The other man can be making hay while the sun shines and you are in the darkness; it is not shining for you. That is the case. They do not forgive you. They may want you up here all along and you may feel that you are doing your necessary part in the work. Therein lies the tragedy of it.

At this serious time we do not need any turn-overs in Congress, in this time when, if possible we need here every man who has had the education and the experience, who has had the advantage of the hearings and knows the past, some matters that involve military secrets. Every man that is in this House who can be kept here ought to be kept here. I do not mind if he was a stark isolationist before Pearl Harbor, if he is going down the road doing his duty now, voting as he sees it and helping carry on the program, he can do a better job on the floor of this Congress than any new man they can possibly send here, because he knows what he is doing and knows what it is all about, and no new man can do that.

So, if we are patriotic, we will forget whether we are Democrats or Republicans, and we lame ducks will do everything in the world we can to get every man that is on this floor and not already defeated back here again to carry on the program that is before us.

There is the problem. When we are staying here month after month, are growing to be strangers to the folks in our districts, they are growing to be strangers to us, yet they are the ones who vote and determine who comes to the Congress of the United States.

Now, a few more questions:

"What about you fellows being asleep at the switch when the Japs hit us at Pearl Harbor?"

"Why haven't you got further along on our war program?"

"Why haven't you as our Congressman brought more industries into this district?"

My district is a potential bomb target. Akron, Chicago, New York, Birmingham, Pittsburgh, and a few others, have been marked off. They do not worry about that. They say, "It is your duty to keep it from being a war target. We want all those things to come here." That is a very touchy subject. Of course, we know that cannot be changed under any circumstances.

"Why don't you let us in on what is going on in Congress?"

"We ought to know. Why didn't you have your fighting planes and trained fighters ready when war came?"

I heard that over and over. If any of you remember, I was out here fighting for that, one of the first ones on the floor to start that sort of fight, but that did not mean anything. They think of

you collectively and vote on you individually. That is what they do. They blamed me for anything anybody in Congress said or did, because they say, "If you can't convince your own men in Congress, how do you expect to convince us here?"

Let me drop back:

"Why didn't you have more fighting planes and trained fighters ready when war came? Had not this question been brewing for years? Why did Congress have to listen to Lindbergh and others when it ought to have been listening to us?"

I had one man ask me that. He said, "Why were not you listening to us instead of listening to Lindbergh?" I said, "I never listened to Lindbergh, only just to listen to what he said in hearings." He said, "Why, you had him up there testifying before your committee and letting him take up your time, our time."

"Why were you up on the radio doing a commercial broadcast when you should have been looking after business in Congress?"

That will not worry the rest of you. They asked me that because I sometimes appeared here on a program.

They asked me why I was taking up time to peel potatoes at the White House. They thought it took me 6 months to peel a few potatoes up there. I peeled a handful of potatoes over there one afternoon for the Communists to look at. I was just giving those Communists a lesson in a little potato-peeling work, but I heard plenty about that, too.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the gentleman recommend commercial broadcasts for other Members of Congress who want to come back?

Mr. PATRICK. I do not. However, I did not get any money for any broadcasting, and I did not do it on the people's time. Whenever Congress was going on or anything I did not do any radio broadcasting. I merely passed that out because while you may not be doing radio broadcasting you will be doing something else, and the man that runs against you will seize on anything. I invite you to study that, and anything you have to do, as a matter of relaxation, do it privately. Do not do it where they can catch records on you.

They have a record of one of my broadcasts, and they played it all over the district and played it on the radio until I had nightmares about it. Congress had adjourned, and I just passed a little joke out on the radio that afternoon. I never fish or hunt or play golf or anything; about the only recreation I have had is running down and speaking on the radio once in a while when I could, when it did not interfere. So I got up there one afternoon. We had a big appropriation bill up here. I said over the radio right down here on station WWDC:

Ladies and gentlemen, we passed some kind of an appropriation bill up there awhile ago. I voted for it. You know how it is with Congressmen, we vote a bill out today, and then buy a paper tomorrow to see what it was.

I thought it was a pretty clever joke, but it did not sound so funny to them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLMER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. But when I heard that played back to me a dozen times down in my district over the radio, at home where the voters listened, I did not think it was a bit clever. But I have no kick coming; he did not hit me with anything except what I provided him with.

I am not mad at my adversary, so help me. We are friends and get along. Of course, I had rather he had not beaten me, but I am not sore at him. It was not my intention for him to beat me, however, I can assure you of that.

He said, Why was he up there doing commercial broadcasting when he should have been looking after your business in Congress? Of course, I did not do any of that when I should be doing anything for them. I tried to explain that I did this only on off time and did not let it interfere with my work at all, but they reserved to themselves the right to pass on that, and the vote reveals that they did pass on it; and, fellow Members of Congress, this brings me to a very serious angle, and that is a matter with which you will be confronted yourselves—but I believe I will give you two or three more questions before I come to that.

"When are we going to invade the continent of Europe?" They will ask you that, or they did me. Oh, yes; that is a military secret, you can tell them, but there are too many secrets from us they seem to feel. "How many fighting men do we have in the Far East?" That is the kind of question they will ask you. "How long does Congress think the war will last?" "When are you going to settle down to a tax program that we can depend upon?"

I wish I could think of all the questions they asked me about taxation. By the way, there are quite a number of questions ready for you on that subject of taxation, I can tell you that. They do very little complaining about heavy taxes. They do not expect to do anything except pay heavy taxes, but they feel that they are not any too clear on what to expect and they think you can enlighten them in a few short sentences and then they will know.

But back to the serious angle to which I referred a while ago and with which I think you will probably be confronted. They seem to feel that your every waking hour should be spent in congressional work. They doubt if the Congress is taking the war as seriously as they are. You would be surprised to find that, wouldn't you? I have heard asked here when the people in the districts are going to wake up to the fact that there is a serious war on. They seem to think we do not take it seriously and the papers seem to convey the same idea. Are the papers right about it? I do not think so. You would not think that could be so in my case, would you? As you know,

there is no Member here who became alarmed at an earlier date and announced his alarm more consistently, but that fact did not save me. As I told you a while ago, they think of Congress collectively and whatever conclusion they reach they vote upon him individually. Many do not like Leon Henderson. They cannot vote against him, but they can vote against the Congressman. They do not like a great many things that have been done here. Each Congressman gets blamed for the whole program. In my case I was the only man who was running they could get at. There was one United States Senator who ran but he did not have any opposition. Leon Henderson did not run for any office; Nelson did not run for any office. None of the men whose names are seen in the papers ran. The only man whose head bobbed above the horizon holding and running for any Government office is the Congressman, so they just take a pop at him. I do not mind being a lame duck in this Congress if by so doing I can be of any help in keeping together the rest of this Congress, so our preparedness and war program for the Nation will not be disrupted by domestic and local issues. One of the severest issues with which I was confronted was the recent seating of a postmaster and fault was not found with the man, but with how it was done, and yet it was regular in every respect, but it was one of these well-known changes by appeal. The Senators recommended my nomination and the man was seated. And if it can be avoided do not let the civil service at you to throw a post-office recommendation in your lap just before election. I cite this to show how the voters are still inclined to follow local issues. Something undoubtedly should be done to give the people confidence in Congress. With the war on and the paper a daily diet, they are quick to read and take seriously all that the present news carries and, on the whole, the press is not friendly to the Members of Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 more minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Something ought to be done about it. It is doing the country no good and threatens to contribute to a very serious condition, dangerous to our security and national welfare.

So if we can, by some means, get an understanding and a feeling of mutual interest and patriotic desire between the Congress of the United States and the press of the United States in this hour of trial and peril, when the Nation's welfare may be hanging in the balance and when its security is at stake and when a war is being fought, this should be done. Of all times there should now be a national unity and there should be a confidence on the part of the people in its law-making body. As it is now, it is dangerous for any man coming before the people for a vote. Two years ago I had no difficulty at all in returning. I went down home this time with only 3

weeks before the first primary, with no doubt I would have any great difficulty. To my astonishment I was headed for defeat, headed to be taken out of the Congress of the United States.

I do not want to bring any painful apprehension to the Members of Congress today here on the floor. You have been working hard and have been working early and late. I do not believe there was ever a more sincere, earnest, hard-hitting, conscientious Congress assembled than is right here at this time, and it is a most unfortunate thing that there has been coming from the press and certain other sources a tendency to tear down the confidence of the people of the United States in its law makers. This is lamentable, and this is more important today than at any other time in the history of our Nation. The people read the papers every day and their boys are going across the ocean and are getting killed. They see many being drafted and they are on the paper's side and when the paper gives a picture that is not entirely clear or gives a picture that is lopsided they can only take that for what it seems to them to be worth, and as a result any condemnation that is felt against any agency or branch of the United States or against some act of the Government of the United States or against the general administration, will be wreaked upon the head of the Congressman, the one lone Congressman who raises his head to run in order to be returned to office from that district. This is unfortunate, it is unfair, it is unhappy and it threatens to weaken the Congress of the United States when it should be at its strongest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. So, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything a "lame duck" can do to help I come before you to contribute my part, be it ever so small, in stopping that floodtide, in overcoming that danger, and I shall be glad to make my little sacrifice at the altar of this Nation's security. I thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] for 15 minutes.

RUBBER AND GASOLINE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks I have opposed in various ways the proposed national rationing of gasoline. Contacts with the Office of Price Administration, individually and jointly with our Michigan delegation, seeking information on different phases and rumors brought no information not to mention results. I did my best to secure some assurance from the O. P. A. that the Middle West would not be rationed until fall, or a reason why such assurance could not be given, but it got me nowhere. I therefore have been interested

in and heartily approve of the aims and work of the committee recently formed to take action in this matter.

Letters and telegrams keep pouring in from my district and State protesting against Nation-wide gasoline rationing. Individuals, service clubs, chambers of commerce, and other organizations emphatically express their willingness to voluntarily conserve rubber and make any other sacrifice which will contribute in any degree to our war effort. But they would like to be shown, at least, even a remote connection between gasoline rationing and the war effort.

The Middle West is drowning in oil. Michigan, for instance, is served by refineries in Detroit, Chicago, and Toledo, which in turn are supplied in abundance by pipe lines from the southwestern oil fields. We could get the gas to filling stations without the use of tank cars. The argument that because inadequate transportation facilities have created a shortage of gasoline on the Atlantic seaboard, that therefore the Middle West, which is drowning in oil, should be muzzled to starve to an equal degree has already been exploded. It would have been just as sensible to say that if a certain number of people in New York had unfortunately broken their legs, we must break the legs of a similar number of people in Michigan.

The argument that gasoline rationing is necessary to conserve road surfaces for military use was even more weak, and died aborning.

So now Mr. Henderson is reduced to the belated argument that this drastic, yes, destructive measure is necessary to conserve rubber and that is to stand willy-nilly. Well, what was the objective of the tire-rationing order? Isn't it reasonable to believe that the vast majority of Americans, knowing no further rubber may be available for the duration will make their rubber last for from 3 to 5 years? And assuming their tires are on the average half worn down, isn't that possible? Must they be put in a straitjacket because of a small percentage who will not so conserve? And does the O. P. A. believe that by gasoline rationing it will have this small percentage in the straitjacket?

Mr. Henderson has publicized the statement that on the Atlantic seaboard those who conserve gasoline—I think he should have said rubber—may legally use what they save from their allotment for recreation or pleasure driving. I repeat, this is Mr. Henderson's statement. Assuming that driving 2,880 miles a year, the amount indicated by Mr. Henderson, is a conservative allotment; that persons who live in cities are willing to walk and use street cars all the year around to gratify their all-year dream of a few weeks of recreation in northern Michigan; that in those few weeks they use one-quarter, one-half, or all their year's allotment so to recreate themselves for the battles of life, does this in any way violate the letter, the spirit, or the program of Mr. Henderson's tire rationing as explained by him? Emphatically it does not.

I am addressing myself to the needs and survival of the resort industry which

is the second largest industry in Michigan. The folly of unnecessarily rationing gas for workers to and from war industries or of the farmer in his war production needs no argument for it is obvious that depriving them of gas is scotching the war effort. Yet, this will be the inevitable result of national gas rationing.

It is true that Michigan's resort business is of secondary importance in the war effort as compared with transportation of war workers and farm production. But it is of tremendous importance nevertheless as a medium which will permit the defense worker, as well as those engaged in essential civilian activities, to enjoy the vacations that will so desperately be needed, as England's experience has so palpably shown, to maintain shop productivity and national morale.

In addition to this contribution, the tourist industry is the second largest industry in Michigan, with a total annual volume in normal times exceeding \$400,000,000. It is the main dependence for livelihood of the majority of people living in the northern half of the State.

It is a business that does not require priorities and does not deplete the raw materials or labor necessary for war production and therefore offers one of the very few opportunities of normal activities compatible with all-out war effort.

The proposed national rationing of gasoline will eliminate three-fourths of this business. It will mean ruin and destruction to thousands of small business men in western and northern Michigan.

This should not be done unless it is to some degree necessary for the war effort. Should such relation be shown to exist, the people of Michigan will gladly make the sacrifice, and any and every other sacrifice necessary for that end. If such reason exists, the people should be taken into the administration's confidence and given the facts.

For instance, the layman might speculate that, with the splendid progress being made for superiority in air power by our aviation personnel, our coming armada of the air demands the creation of a gasoline stock pile. However, it is well known that in making high-grade octane gasoline for the American air forces our refineries produce as a by-product a low-grade gasoline that must be either consumed in the ordinary way or destroyed. Storage facilities are already overtaxed and civilians could get along on that low-grade gas if the high grade ran short. This contingency, if it did face us, could not possibly materialize until late in the fall. However, no such claim is made by the Price Administrator, nor has he said that his tire-rationing program is a failure. Of course, the rubber situation defies check or analysis, but even that does not affect the problem of rational use of tires on the cars of John Q. Public.

Congress should take immediate steps to survey the Midwest gasoline situation and oppose the national rationing of gasoline unless Mr. Henderson and others show that it is in some degree necessary for the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks one of the telegrams received by me on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GRAND HAVEN, MICH., June 8, 1942.
Congressman B. J. JONKMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

We, the undersigned, find that the people in our locality resent any proposal to ration gasoline presumably for the purpose of conserving rubber. Our people have curtailed speed and car use voluntarily. We ask that you, as our elected representative, make known in Congress the wishes of your constituents.

WM. L. STRIBLEY,
Officer, Chamber of Commerce.
JAMES VAN ZYLEN,
Officer, Kiwanis Club.
FRANK MASON,
Officer, Rotary Club.
GEORGE M. JOHNSON,
Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the program tomorrow will be the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill, and after that the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATRICK). Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 5 minutes.

OUR SPEAKER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of Washington's papers recently carried an article under a 3-column, black-face lead, RAYBURN's Grip on House Appears To Be Weakening.

Following that came the statement:

No one has protested current criticism of Congress more loudly than SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House.

Now the Speaker himself is coming in for criticism, because of the rebuff to his leadership early this week when the House deserted him and rejected the Texas-Florida pipe line and barge line bill which Mr. RAYBURN had espoused personally to the point of taking the floor in its support—rare for a Speaker.

That blow to his prestige is being talked of, not as an isolated incident, but as symptomatic of a situation.

Mr. RAYBURN's stout defense of Congress as an institution, and his own recent failure as leader are being linked by certain critical observers.

It has been my privilege to serve under but three Speakers—Speaker Byrns, Speaker Bankhead, and the present occupant of the chair. While life lasts, the memory of the dignity, the kindness, the fairness, the devotion to duty of Speaker Joseph W. Byrns, Speaker William B. Bankhead, and Speaker Sam Rayburn will be always with me.

Being a member of the opposition party, being sincerely opposed to many of

the New Deal policies, never having hesitated to express in unmistakable terms, and sometimes vigorously, my opinion of proposed legislation, it is but natural that the Speaker of the House, the representative of the party in power, should be somewhat critical of my efforts. It would not be at all strange if, in the heat of debate, in the justifiable striving for party advantage, I should tax the patience, disturb the equanimity of the presiding officer.

Doubtless, on many occasions, I have given adequate reason for a short answer. But let me, as one of the most outspoken opponents of administration domestic policies, pay my tribute here and now to the Speaker of this House.

If any think that the Speaker's control of this House has in any way weakened or is less than it should be, they should revise their opinion. The present Speaker, as the two preceding him, whom I knew, never made any attempt to stifle the action of this House.

True, the Speaker has endeavored, as he has the right and as he should, because of his official position, to direct and to control the House procedure. That he has done with an iron hand, even though he wore the velvet glove.

It is true that, on occasion, the present Speaker has taken the floor, as Speakers in the past have taken the floor, as was their right, their duty, and urged the adoption of legislation handed down by the administration.

Equally true is it that, on occasion, the House has refused to follow that request. When speaking from the floor, the Speaker of the House represented his district and he did not assume to speak as one occupying the chair. The Speaker has not sought to use the influence of his high position to override the judgment, the conscientious objections of any Member of this House. For that he is to be commended—not criticized.

Never within my recollection has the present Speaker for one single instant, while acting as Speaker, lost control of this body. Never has he been charged from the floor with unfairness, with favoritism. Always the Members of this House have acknowledged his fairness, his kindness, and his authority.

Today, as one opposed to the follies of the New Deal, pledging continued opposition to its economic fallacies, to its wasteful spending, I pay tribute to the ability, the sincerity, the fairness, the kindness of the Speaker of the House and hail him as the just and kindly ruler of this body.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, one to include an address by Attorney General Biddle and the other a radio address by the Minister of New Zealand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] for 40 minutes.

SILVER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I have spent considerable time in preparing a list of the inconsistencies being presented through the columns of the press from time to time in respect to the matter of silver. Some time ago I made a statement and inserted in the RECORD a pronouncement of some 65 economists, and answered it individually. In reply I have here a letter from the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy under date of May 12, being an open letter signed by Prof. Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics of New York University, addressed to me, in reply to a statement I made in answer to a previous letter issued by this committee.

I shall insert that as a part of my remarks before going on with my reply. In answer to this open letter on silver I addressed a letter to Mr. Spahr under date of July 5, with which I follow Mr. Spahr's open letter, and I do this for the consideration and information of the House:

AN OPEN LETTER ON SILVER

A REPLY TO A LETTER FROM HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM IDAHO, READ INTO CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF APRIL 30 (From Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University, and secretary, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy)

MAY 12, 1942.

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,

Member of Congress from Idaho.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: I should like to reply to your letter and other observations, directed to the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, with respect to our Government's silver policy. My comments are solely my own, since no member of this committee may speak for another.

One of your major contentions is that the millions of dollars of profit to the Government arising out of the actual and potential seigniorage on our Treasury silver since 1934 serves as an important answer to the objections of monetary economists to the Government's silver program. You say (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 30, p. 3856, column 2) that "you—economists—object to our Government making this little profit in the present emergency, at a time when every monetary thread in the national financial fabric is strained to the utmost."

My objection to that profit is that it is not as large as it should be. I object to the Government paying 71.11 cents per ounce for domestic silver, when it should be bought, if the Government buys silver for currency purposes, at the uncontrolled market price which at present apparently would not exceed 35 cents per ounce and might be much less if the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 were repealed—unless war demands of industry raise the price abnormally. I know of no valid reason why the Government, when buying a metal for nonstandard or subsidiary monetary purposes, should pay more than its value in a free, open, world market.

If our Government had pursued this policy, then its profit would have been very much larger and the burdens on the American people, which you contend are lessened by the Government's present silver policy, would have been reduced still further and correspondingly.

Your argument, therefore, should be reversed: The American people, through their Government, are deprived of a profit, which otherwise they would have had, because the Treasury has been compelled to pay a price for silver far above its market price in order to subsidize the silver interests. What could

have been greater gains for the people in general have been reduced by this subsidy, and their financial burdens have been and are increased, not lessened.

You write of silver coin and silver certificates yielding a profit, being interest free and, therefore, superior to Federal Reserve notes which, you allege in various paragraphs, involve an interest cost. For example, you say "it would be interesting to know if the members of your committee have calculated the difference in cost on the item of interest between the expense of using Federal Reserve money and the use of interest-free silver money. * * *

This is, to say the least, a peculiar argument. If the seigniorage feature with respect to silver is to be regarded as the determining factor in weighing the cost of one currency against another, then one would be forced to advocate an irredeemable paper money on which the seigniorage to the Government would be 100 percent.

Silver coin and certificates cost the Government what it contributes to the cost of minting the coin and the cost of the paper and printing of the silver certificates, less the seigniorage. But silver money and certificates cost the seller of silver what it costs him to produce the silver. Federal Reserve notes cost the Government the price of the paper, printing, overhead, and so on—a negligible amount. They cost the user nothing more than any other money costs him, which may be nothing at all. Federal Reserve notes today are gold certificates in nature; those in actual circulation are secured by approximately 107 percent gold certificates which, in turn, are fully secured by gold. There is certainly no more of an interest factor here than in the use of gold certificates. In more normal times, when Federal Reserve notes might be secured by the minimum of 40 percent of gold or gold certificates plus not less than 60 percent of additional assets in eligible paper or Government securities, they pass into circulation in accordance with people's demands on the banks. It is merely a question of people's preferences for notes as against metallic currency and checks, and the member banks get from the Reserve banks whichever is demanded. Once silver certificates find their way into the banks and into the Reserve banks as reserves against the latter's deposits, they are drawn out substantially as are Federal Reserve notes. Both may pass into circulation as a consequence of bank loans or investments. Therefore interest can be related to either one as well as to all our other currency.

Consequently, in the last analysis, if cost of silver money and Federal Reserve notes is to be considered, it is more accurate to compute the cost to the producer of getting the silver and to compare it with the infinitely smaller cost to the Government of providing Federal Reserve notes. It is not accurate to relate loans and investments to Federal Reserve notes but not to silver coin and certificates, if one wishes to relate interest to the different kinds of money in use. And, if seigniorage is to be the determining factor, then we would be forced to irredeemable paper money.

You write of silver certificates being "as good as gold" (for example, p. 3858). That, simply, is not true. At 35 cents per ounce of silver, the market value of silver in a silver dollar is approximately 27 cents. In foreign trade, silver has to pass at this world market value, at 27 cents for each dollar of gold. Therefore, the Treasury uses gold in lieu of this cheap, overvalued silver. Domestically, all our currency is interchangeable—paper money, silver, minor coins, bank deposits. But they all stop at the international boundary line, and gold picks up the burden from there on. Since the domestic nongold currency stops at the border, and since gold becomes the international settling agent, paper money, if convertible into gold, will

do the job just as well as silver, and it is much cheaper.

The program of expanding our supply of silver currency is, therefore, throwing an ever-increasing burden on our gold supply. In future years, when peace comes, and when our gold supply is reduced through its export, which may reasonably be expected, this silver load on our gold will become of increasing importance because silver cannot do in foreign trade what gold must and does do. The silver-purchase program forces the Treasury to expand this load on gold, quite apart from any needs of business and the possible future supply of gold. Paper currency, on the other hand—for example, Federal Reserve notes and gold certificates—would expand and contract with some relation to the gold supply and, as a consequence, would not be throwing a load on the gold which the gold would not automatically meet. This is not the case with silver under the present silver-purchase program; the load on gold is steadily mounting and there is no reason to expect a contraction as the gold base grows narrower in years to come. In this connection, there is something of a lesson to be found in our experiences under the Sherman Silver Purchase Act of 1890-93. Now is the time to stop laying the groundwork for another such unpleasant episode at some future date.

It is substantially accurate to say that today there is no better reason for buying silver, storing it, and issuing certificates against it than there would be for buying any other metal worth 35 cents per ounce and issuing certificates against it or coining it at \$1.29 per ounce. And, when silver is badly needed in industry in time of war, it is little short of criminal to indulge in such an enterprise. To this is to be added the fact that we not only do not need this additional currency but would be safer with much less. Conclusive proof is provided in the fact that when our price level was 167 in June 1920 (1926 prices equal 100 percent), the supply of money in circulation was only \$5,181,000,000, whereas in February 1942, with the price level at approximately 96, the supply of money in circulation was \$11,485,000,000. Furthermore, while the Government is trying to prevent runaway prices, the supporters of the silver program insist on contributing to a rise in prices by feeding the expansion in our money supply.

In the last paragraph of your letter you say to the monetary economists who oppose this silver program: "Gentlemen, be patriotic; lend your knowledge and your ability to your country; help the Members of Congress representing the people to right the financial ship of state * * *," and so on. Precisely! The members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy certainly have no other purpose. They have no personal, private interests in any of these issues. They merely hope that their accumulated knowledge may be put to some good use in this country.

But can the supporters of the silver program, which was forced upon the Treasury, say the same for their position, past and present?

Briefly and in summary this is their position: They force the Treasury to pay an artificial price for silver so that the silver interests shall be subsidized. They have taken for the silver interests profits which should have gone to the people as a whole. They cause the currency to be expanded when it should not be expanded. They insist upon contributing to rising prices while the Government is attempting to hold them down. They deprive the country of a much-needed metal even in time of war. They cause the Treasury to create an expensive money when a cheaper and good one is readily available. They pile up a future and possibly dangerous burden on gold. They wrecked the metallic money base of China and threw her into an

inconvertible paper currency system at a most dangerous period in her history, and now she is reaping tragic results in a runaway depreciation of her currency at the very time that she should be strongest. They unsettled currencies in other countries with consequences that have been uniformly deplorable.

It is a sorry picture and a sad commentary on our dealings with our own people and other nations of the world—particularly struggling China.

This crude meddling with delicate monetary standards and systems is to be explained on no better ground than that the currency expansionists and silverites, in their efforts to serve their own interests, either had little understanding of the implications of their acts or had little regard for the welfare of their fellow countrymen and other nations.

The members of the Economists' National Committee warned Congress and the Administration as to what the consequences to China, other countries, and ourselves would be if this program were pursued. There is no satisfaction to be found in reminding the silverites and the public of this fact. All that we can do now is to urge Congress to end this disgraceful business and to return as rapidly as possible to sounder monetary policies.

Since you raised the question of patriotism with respect to the silver issue, it would seem appropriate to point out that the needs of our country for silver in industry while we are at war should alone be sufficient to compel you and all your associates to abandon this silver program and to return the silver to its more appropriate and profitable use.

Sincerely,

WALTER E. SPAHR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION
AND RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1942.

MR. WALTER E. SPAHR,
Secretary, Economists' National
Committee on Monetary Policy,
New York City, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. SPAHR: The sustained interest of yourself and your Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy in the Government's silver purchase program and the use of silver as money, as explained in your open letter of May 12, is appreciated.

In dealing with this subject, it is my earnest wish that the position of yourself and the members of your committee could be made to square with the facts and that you and the 65 associated economists could be united in recognizing and supporting this most profitable fiscal operation of the United States Treasury. While I am somewhat reluctant to take issue with yourself and the eminent members of your committee, the interest of the American people in the workings of their monetary system compels me to recite for your consideration certain facts.

In order to approach the subject of the use of silver in our monetary system and to clear the issue of misunderstandings and uncertainties, certain fundamental principles of economic law should be recognized and accepted. In this connection, it would be interesting to know if you and your associated economists subscribe to the fundamental principle of the basic need for a monetary unit of stable value.

Do you accept the principle laid down by the United States Monetary Commission?—

"It is the volume of money keeping even pace with advancing population and commerce and in the resultant steadiness in prices that the wholesome nutrient of healthy vitality is to be found. The highest material development of nations is prompted by the use of money of unchanging value."

And do you subscribe to the same principle stated by President Roosevelt in another way when he said?—

"The United States seeks the kind of a dollar which a generation hence will have the same purchasing and debt-paying power as the dollar value we hope to attain in the near future."

Do you and your committee approve the kind of a dollar demanded in the platform of the National Grange?

"Agriculture demands a monetary system providing an honest dollar—one just to the debtor and creditor alike, with constant purchasing power preventing uncontrolled inflation and the disastrous effects of deflation."

If we are in agreement on these simple principles, we can make a better approach to the question at issue, namely, the profits made by the Government, which in a broader sense is the American people, on its silver-purchase program. Now with the Treasury's seigniorage table before you, and it is before you, having been inserted in my letter which you have answered, can you point to any money transaction by any government in any period in history where a government has made such a large profit by acquiring money metal and exercising its money-creating prerogative in revaluing this metal and using the metal for the creation of money? Not even the recent fiscal operations of the British Government in debasing its silver coinage, when it extracted 90,000,000 ounces of silver from its subsidiary coins by reducing their silver standard from .925 fine to .500 fine and following this up by withdrawing silver money from circulation in India and dumping it on the world market with disastrous results to our economic standards, has gained by this destructive use of silver an amount equal to the profits that have accrued to our Government in its beneficial use of silver as money.

From a factual standpoint in dealing with the silver items presented in the United States Treasury statement before us, in doing your bookkeeping, particularly in making the credit entry of silver seigniorage taken from the table on page 76 of the April Treasury Bulletin, you must put down the item of \$195,000,000 seigniorage (profit) on the minting of the minor coins and also add the other item of \$807,200,000 seigniorage on silver dollars and silver certificates; making a total seigniorage on silver of \$1,002,500,000. Coming to Federal Reserve notes, the other kind of money, there isn't any profit item to the Government. As a cost item you have to set down, as you state, "Federal Reserve notes cost the Government the price of the paper, printing, overhead, and so on, a negligible amount." (P. 3 of your open letter on Silver, May 12, 1942.) In casting up accounts we will leave out entirely the last silver seigniorage item appearing in the Treasury table under the heading "Potential seigniorage on silver bullion at cost (unvalued) in the General Fund." To reduce this monetary accounting to accepted standards for our understanding, it might be advisable to engage a certified public accountant. The difficulty would then be, as I see it, to find one that could prepare and bring in a financial statement that would support your contention.

As the burden of your argument was directed to the past record and future effect of the use of silver money on our national economy, it is important that we proceed to analyze the facts presented in the long record of the use of the metal as money in light of your contention.

I am sure you recognize the fact that our currency in the form of Federal Reserve notes is exclusively issued by the Federal Reserve banks, and the further fact that the gold stock in the possession of the United States Treasury and nominally in the ownership of the Government is in reality owned by the Federal Reserve banks, with the exception of the gold in the stabilization fund and a small item of gold held for the redemption of paper currency long since recalled but still unac-

counted for, the Federal Reserve ownership of the gold being represented by the gold certificates issued to and held by these banks.

In using their bank credit and gold holdings as a basis for creating money—i. e., Federal Reserve notes—it is clearly apparent that for anyone to get new Federal Reserve money issued of necessity must borrow from their bank—and pay interest. If the borrower is to conduct a profitable business, he must pro rate the interest item on the goods he sells as a part of the cost of doing business, and this interest cost in the general run of business is paid by the ultimate consumer.

Under the bank plan for creating and putting money in circulation, when the supporting note becomes due, not only the money must come back to the bank but the interest money along with it, and, when the money is paid to the bank, it remains in the bank unless another borrower is on hand or comes along to repeat the money-circulation operation by securing another bank loan. In this respect our Government is no different from an individual, and in order to get money or credit the Government must borrow it—and pay interest.

In view of this fact, just how do you explain your statement, "Federal Reserve notes cost the Government the price of the paper, printing, overhead and so on—a negligible amount"? If your statement is correct it must be news to the United States Treasury officials who have been exchanging good interest-bearing Government bonds for these self-same Federal Reserve notes in equal amount ever since the Government has been borrowing money.

In considering the interest factor as a cost of circulating money, you say, "They (Federal Reserve notes) cost the user nothing more than any other money costs him—which may be nothing at all." In some cases this might be a factual statement but in most cases it does cost him more. The amount of the interest added to what he buys—more. When he exchanges his money for goods owned by the borrower of Federal Reserve money—the maker of the supporting eligible paper—the note that got the money out of the bank in the first place, he pays the interest item which has been prorated and added to the price of the merchandise he buys.

You say, "There is certainly no more interest factor here than in the use of gold certificates, in more normal times when Federal Reserve notes might be secured by a minimum of 40-percent gold or gold certificates plus not less than 60 percent of additional assets in eligible paper or Government securities they pass into circulation in accordance with the people's demand on the banks." To paraphrase your remarks, "This is, to say the least, a peculiar argument," when you compare the way the gold miner gets his gold certificate or the silver miner gets his silver certificate for the gold or silver he deposits with the mint and spends this money for the things he buys, and then compare the method by which new Federal Reserve notes are put out in making loans. Do you seek to imply the interest factor is the same in both cases? What you have said may be repeated, "There is certainly no more interest factor here." There certainly is. The banks hold the monetary gold stock—all of it—gold which is indispensable under the law governing the creation and issuance of money, with the sole exception of silver money, and the banks are collecting interest for the use of the currency they issue against their gold certificates or any credit they extend. On the other hand, the gold and silver certificates—currency the miner gets and puts into circulation—passes in and out of the banks who make their profit in doing a banking business on the basis of dealers in money and credit which they lend at interest in conducting a regular banking business. I contend that banks are not entitled to make a special profit as creators of money as they

are now doing under the present money system.

As the law stands our supply of money must come from the banks, a plan which you and your associates insist on broadening to the exclusion of all other kinds of money, a plan so unstable that when the least little tremor of financial fear shakes the confidence of these money creators, the flow of money dries up, as the American people have learned to their sorrow.

We all know that the money manufacturing banks exact interest for the use of the money they create and you and I and the rest of us to obtain the necessities of life will have to pay that interest, and good, old Uncle Sam, which is another way of saying the United States, will have to pay his share of interest which is a big item when you compute the interest on the \$72,000,000,000 he now owes. It would be difficult to convince the average income taxpayer and defense-bond subscriber that it isn't costing the Government anything to use Federal Reserve money, because it always has cost to use bank money and always will, or the banks would go broke.

Noting your reference to the preference of the public for paper money, this may be the result of convenience or bank policy, or both, due to the custom of the banks here, as the banks do in India, by taking in deposits of coin and rigidly adhering to a policy of issuing paper money in return whenever the money is paid out again. By following this method, in time all the coins in circulation can be retired and replaced with paper money as was done in India in retiring silver rupees; and when we consider that \$150,000,000 of this cheaply manufactured paper money, referred to in the first part of your letter, failed to come back for redemption at the time the Secretary of Treasury, Mr. Mellon, called in and retired all the bills of larger dimensions, we find one of the reasons for the banks' preference for paper money, a preference that has been a settled banking policy ever since the advantage and profits obtainable from the use of bank paper money came to be recognized and understood after the invention of national bank notes under the provisions of the National Bank Act of 1863 which accounts for the motive responsible for the emergence of the political issue between paper money versus silver money.

Naturally, with the banks receiving a dual-interest income for the use of their paper money, one the interest on the Government bonds placed on deposit in the Treasury against which the national bank notes were issued and the other the interest on the national bank notes themselves loaned into circulation at current rates of interest, why shouldn't the banks fight silver and the creation of new silver money that encroaches on their interest-gathering prerogatives?

I am sure every thoughtful person understands the need for banks and the value of their services to their community and to the country. In transacting a banking business as dealers in money and credit, the flow of currency of all kinds is their stock in trade on which they are entitled to make a legitimate profit and a fair return on their investment and fair compensation for their banking service, albeit a full measure of profit for the exercise of good judgment and business acumen in the conduct of their business, but they are not entitled to the concession to create and put out new money.

In considering the application of existing laws providing for the purchase of money metals—gold and silver—gold is being bought at its full monetary value of \$35 per ounce and domestic silver at 71.11 cents or 55 percent of its monetary value of \$1.29½ per ounce for which the metal is being used. You apparently approve the gold price which yields no profit to the Government, but in speaking of the silver miners in our country

you complain, "They force the Treasury to pay an artificial price for silver so that the silver interests shall be subsidized," when in fact the Government is simply following its long-established policy of protecting our domestic industries from cheap foreign competition and reduced living standards by allocating to the silver miners a small share of the Government's profits made in converting the metal into money above the world price, a plan which has the most stimulating and beneficial effect on our national economy from which, in the case of the silver-mining industry, both the Government and business receive manifold benefits, particularly when you consider the industry's contribution to the national tax income and the Nation's business.

It would be difficult to find a more prolific source of Government tax income with streams of tax money flowing to the Government from all sources all along the line from the miners' wages up to the salaries of mine officers and a whole galaxy of taxes paid by the mining companies on their own account—corporation income taxes, capital stock taxes, franchise taxes, severance taxes, real-estate taxes—not to mention the long list of taxes flowing from other business supported by the mining industry.

We also find that by establishing a stable market for silver, we are indirectly financing the production of many and much of the related metals vitally needed in our national industries. Naturally, the monetary scheme insisted upon by your committee would stop all this and divert this source of revenue to foreign gold fields and the accruing tax revenue to the treasuries of foreign governments.

It would be with extreme regret that I would find myself forced to resort to sophistry to sustain an argument. Were you referring to the Government in the abstract when you said, "In the last analysis, if cost of silver money and Federal Reserve notes is to be considered, it is more accurate to compute the cost to the producer of getting the silver and to compare it with the infinitely smaller cost to the Government of providing Federal Reserve notes." The fact is that the Government *per se* makes profit acquiring domestic silver which is definitely fixed in the provisions of the Domestic Silver Purchase Act of July 6, 1939, 55 percent of the money minted from the silver is turned back to the producer and 45 percent is retained by the Government; and in buying foreign silver the Government makes the difference between the world price for silver and its face value when minted or placed in circulation in the form of silver certificates. On the contrary in creating Federal Reserve money the Government is paid for the bare cost of the paper and the engraving. However, in this democracy the people are the Government and the people must borrow and pay interest on Federal Reserve money to use it; and when you make that the only kind of money in circulation, as you are attempting to do, naturally the people and the Government must borrow to have it created and pay interest to the banks to keep it in circulation.

If the Secretary of the Treasury elects to use only a part of the silver he purchases, or "up to the cost of the silver," under the provisions of the law, that is the people's loss; if instead of keeping this excess silver idle it were used in any way, it would still represent a clear profit to the Government wherever you put it, so when you come to compare the cost of silver money with Federal Reserve money, it will take a more convincing argument than any that has yet been presented to prove the fact that the Federal Reserve money is cheaper to use than silver money.

I maintain that silver certificates as presently used are "as good as gold." This kind of money is doing everything that gold could do; it is performing perfectly the three functions of money—a measure of value, a medium of exchange, and, when laid away,

is a store of wealth ready for immediate use—and these silver certificates are more convenient to handle and cheaper to transport than gold.

As for financing our foreign trade, when the volume of gold proves to be insufficient and unavailable to finance international business transactions, we have been forced in recent times to go back to the primitive system of barter. Now, I hope your committee will not try to convince anyone that barter is superior to the use of money in financial transactions with all its unwieldiness and extra expense and avenues for middlemen's profits. What you say of gold, now overvalued, and silver, purposely undervalued, was recognized by our national leaders and the Congress in passing and placing on our statute books sections 311 and 313 of the United States Code, which is copied here for your information, a law which still stands on our statute books:

"Sec. 311. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetalism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts."

"Section 313: International bimetalism. The provisions of sections 146, 313, 314, 320, 406, 408, 429, 455, and 751 of this title and sections 51, 101, and 178 of title 12, Banks and Banking, are not intended to preclude the accomplishment of international bimetalism whenever conditions shall make it expedient and practicable to secure the same by concurrent action of the leading commercial nations of the world and at a ratio which shall insure permanence of relative value between gold and silver (May 14, 1900, ch. 41, p. 14, 31 Stat. 49)."

Doubtless your committee knows that international bimetalism was tried and worked with a standardization of the coinage under an international agreement by France, Italy, Belgium, and Switzerland until it was destroyed by Germany when that country defeated France in the War of 1870.

A great orator, a great Republican, and a great statesman, James G. Blaine, said:

"The two metals have existed side by side in harmonious, honorable companionship as money ever since intelligent trade was known among men. Silver and gold (have) reigned supreme as representative of value. The dethronement of each has been attempted in turn and sometimes the dethronement of both; but always in vain."

Today under your very eyes the dethronement of both gold and silver as money is being tried anew at the frightful cost to our country of a national debt of \$75,000,000 when all the attendant loss and expense is piling up on the taxpayers. Just as the minute men flew to the rescue of the Colonials, let your 65 economists come to the service of their country. Let us free the American people from the fetters of an unworkable, depressing money system and loosen this unbearable interest load before it is too late.

Your statement that the use of silver currency "is throwing an ever-increasing burden on our gold supply," when we consider the Government's silver-purchase program in its application, it appears "that your argument should be reversed." The Congress to provide for the "more economical use of gold" has made Government bonds eligible security

for the issuance of Federal bank currency. Now, by putting silver to use as security for the issuance of silver-certificate money, we have relieved the strain on gold as a backing for the issuance of money just to that extent.

In advocating an elastic currency, you say "for example, Federal Reserve notes and gold certificates would expand and contract with some relation to the gold supply." By this you mean a fluctuating currency; this goes to the very core of our monetary problems. Hasn't experience and your observation of the last 12 years demonstrated to your complete satisfaction the disastrous effect of a fluctuating currency and the adverse effect of money contraction on credit and the depressing effect of impaired credit on values of every kind—and do you advocate this kind of money as a sound principle in a monetary system that will subject the security of business and the integrity of future commitments to the vagaries of a shifting gold supply and the instability of bankers' confidence?

In the efforts of your committee to assist the Congress and our country in attempting to devise a better monetary system conforming more closely to the principles of economic law "in the interest of a sounder currency and the public welfare," it should be clearly apparent that the national monetary system based on a volume of currency—money of ultimate redemption—automatically controlled that increases evenly with the growth of population and commerce, money that will remain in existence and on deposit in banks in times of business contraction and subject to the call and use of its owner in time of financial stress is a safer monetary system than the more elastic plan of retiring and writing off currency and leaving business dependent on the confidence of the banks for the re-creation and issuance of money under the credit scheme of the Federal Reserve banking system? You must have witnessed the almost complete failure of the plan you advocate in the closing days of the Hoover administration to the ruin of business and the consternation of our bankers and financiers.

Is it your considered opinion that at a time when the public debt is around \$72,000,000,000, and increasing daily that there is too much cash in circulation, as stated in your letter, "To this is to be added the fact that we do not need this additional currency but would be safer with much less"—how safer? And can the same formula be applied to ordinary business? Big debts and little money. Many a businessman and farmer has lost out under this condition.

Is it substantially accurate to say that today there is no better reason for buying silver, storing it, and issuing certificates against it and thereby increasing the volume of redeemable money in circulation than to approve, as it may be assumed you have, an increase of \$2,000,000,000 unredeemable new money issued by the Federal Reserve banks, which has been done since last June, which is far more money than all the silver we have would make if it were revalued and put in circulation in the form of silver certificates?

Evidently you condemn the silver miner as being responsible for a moderate increase in our currency when you say "they cause the currency to be expanded when it should not be expanded." In saying this, have you kept in touch with the present money situation? Is it possible that you condemn the miner and at the same time approve the action of the Federal Reserve banks by expanding the currency by over \$2,000,000,000 between last June and this March, which has been followed by adding another \$200,000,000 during the month of April? Can this be consistent?

Noting your reference to the lesson learned from past financial experience, particularly "the lesson to be found in our experience under the Sherman Silver Purchase Act of 1890-93," must we go back and review all the fallacious arguments put out as to the effect and responsibility of the Sherman Sil-

ver Purchase Act of 1890 for the depression of 1893 of past and unpleasant memories? As long as you have brought that up, the facts will be briefly stated to set you straight.

When you are sitting in judgment and weighing the issues in this case, on one side of the scale you must weigh the effect of the purchase of silver on the national economy of that day and on the other side you must weigh the effect of the manipulations of the financiers of that time to embarrass the Government for the purpose of discrediting silver to the end that silver money would be discarded and replaced with bank-created interest-bearing currency. It took a terrific financial jolt to the country to secure the adoption of their plan but it was managed and bank money triumphed over silver money. In reviewing the facts in this case we find that there was nothing disturbing in our financial system by adding \$400,000,000 a month to the money stream paid out for the purchase of new silver. The plan had worked from the time of the passage of the Bland-Allison Act in 1878 up to 1890, during a period of one of the greatest eras of development this country has ever experienced and business in this country grew and thrived at the same time. But, like humans, the banks were never satisfied.

Naturally, if the creation of bank currency, secured by interest-bearing Government bonds on which the banks collected dual interest the operation of a monetary scheme by which money could be created and loaned into the channels of trade and business at current bank interest rates, which at the time was rarely less than 8 percent, was so profitable, why let all of this new silver be coined and be put into circulation to reduce a good market for the bankers' money product—national bank-note currency?

After establishing the motive that led up to the financial debacle of 1893, we can proceed to consider the facts as they developed; the decline in the value of silver that was produced in excess of the Government purchases and the steady lowering of prices of our basic commodities of that period coupled with the demands of the silver advocates for the restoration of bimetalism which were partly mollified by the increase in the purchase of silver from 4,000,000 ounces per month under the provisions of the Bland-Allison Act to 4,500,000 ounces per month under the Sherman Silver Purchase Act to be paid for by issuing Treasury notes—mind you, not silver-certificate currency redeemable in silver dollars, but Treasury notes supported as to their money value by gold under the provisions of section 311 of the United States Code at a time when it was necessary for the Government to maintain a gold reserve of sufficient quantity to pay its bonded indebtedness and interest in gold, the Government, or to be more specific its Treasury, having been manipulated into this position, it was a simple matter for the financial manipulators to bring back to the United States Treasury the new Treasury notes being paid out for silver as fast as they were issued and by demanding and receiving gold in redemption of this kind of currency embarrass the Government by thus draining away the Treasury gold reserve. The coup in discrediting silver money was completed by a concerted contraction of bank credit. The financial jolt was successfully administered to the country and the issue was won—silver was discredited and the Sherman Act was repealed. Bank money under the gold standard scheme at last was supreme, and to this good day every school child and many of our economists have been made to see the fallacy of the so-called silver heresy. Many of these so-called economists, in spite of all demonstrated facts revealing the instability of the bank-money scheme, still cling to their illusions and solemnly proclaim the fallacy of bimetalism. What can we say to the pronouncement of Joseph Caillaux, the emi-

nent French financier who was entrusted by his Government in stabilizing the French franc, when he announced:

"There is one remedy. It is not that there should be any redistribution of gold, as is being childishly suggested. Gold has its own law which it obeys. What must be done is that another monetary metal should be joined to it. Platinum has been suggested. I would prefer that silver, which was stupidly demonetized, should be rehabilitated."

In the second paragraph of page 4 of your letter we are again subjected to the argument relied upon to explode the so-called quantitative theory of money and disprove this principle of economic law which in its modern and broader application is still controlling. In contravention of your attempt to controvert this theory, let me say at the outset that the volume of money coupled with the volume of credit controls the average commodity price level. The two periods of abnormal conditions selected to prove your point are unique in our country's financial history. Solemnly it is pointed out that on some particular day when the volume of money was some fixed amount, the average commodity price was at some certain level, and later when the volume of money was increased substantially, the average of commodity prices was found to be at a lower level, thereby proving and settling forever the falsity of the proposition of price relation with the money volume which you attempt to demonstrate by pointing to the \$5,181,000,000 in circulation in June 1920 with the price level averaging 167, and then by turning to the \$11,485,000,000 in circulation in February 1942, with an average price level that had declined to 96, and thereby as far as you are concerned the quantitative theory of money is completely exploded. But, my good and eminent economist, to reach any proven result we must consider all of the factors in our equation. The effect of bank credit supplemental to the money volume does control the average commodity price level.

In making a determination as to the relation between the money volume and the average commodity price level all the factors at work in the periods you have selected must be taken into account. The buoyant effect on our prices of English and French securities dumped into the channels of trade and business in this country in financing the World War and our own war financing, which even submerged the value and influence of gold for a time, had an effect which had not then subsided to be closely followed by pouring out \$200,000,000 in purchasing domestic silver under the provisions of the Pittman Silver Purchase Act—all of these credit and financial factors contributed to establishing the high average of the commodity price level at the period selected by you to prove the disassociation of the money volume with the commodity price level. On the other hand, the second period selected was during a time of severe credit contraction, a condition that the doubling up of the currency could not overcome. In making your equations, it would be interesting to know whether you gaged all the factors contributing to this financial condition and if you followed the financial record as indicated in the press reports appearing from time to time in the metropolitan papers for a long period preceding the last date selected for your example. Evidently the reduction of business loans of from nineteen to twenty million dollars a week, month after month, with a corresponding reduction in brokers' loans running up to \$20,000,000 a week over the same period exerted a depressing effect on the average commodity price level responsible for the variation at the period of time you have selected.

Now that credit has become the larger factor in our financial structure due to the fact that the money function has been

shifted from a cash basis to a credit basis under a managed currency system, it develops that in time of financial stress when credit fails and the volume of cash comes back into control of prices—commodity prices must be violently readjusted, which causes the conditions that destroys equities and destroys business.

In speaking of the silver miners, you state "they cause the Treasury to create an expensive money when a cheaper and good one is readily available"—very interesting if you can indicate the kind of money you have in mind and demonstrate how it is cheaper. Who would get the saving on its manufacture and use? In light of the facts as to the mechanics and expense of creating and circulating Federal Reserve money, is the use of fiat or printing press money proposed? Russia and Germany tried that with disastrous results.

Noting your reference to China and the oriental countries, evidently you deplore our favorable balance of trade with China and the flow of Chinese money to this country in financing this business. The fact that Japan has stripped China of its metallic money and forced the Japanese so-called Federal Reserve currency into circulation in China is not our responsibility, nor can the disastrous results be blamed on our Government nor by inference on the silver miners.

It seems that the world is at the mercy of its financiers and bankers and poor China is no exception to the rule.

Could you, and would the kind of a money system you advocate permit you to favor a plan to replace this paper currency by restoring China's silver money to circulation and how would you suggest doing it?

If a metallic money base is necessary for the stability of the national economy of China and an incontrovertible paper system is dangerous, as you say, for the Chinese commonwealth, what about this country and our incontrovertible paper currency, when we are afloat on the shoals of an unpayable public debt and engaged in financing a world-wide war?

Recognizing the efforts of the members of your committee to safeguard the general welfare by warning "Congress and the administration as to what the consequences to China, other countries and ourselves would be, if this program were pursued" and the effect of "crude meddling with delicate monetary standards and systems," if this program were pursued, when we come to consider financial events in recent oriental history in this connection and their bearing on the affairs of this country in light of your condemnation of the disturbance of the Chinese metallic money system by the operation of our domestic monetary program, it would be extremely interesting to have your reactions to the British manipulation of the money system in India subsequent to the World War when they withdrew silver money from circulation in India and at the same time levied an 8-percent duty on silver importations and proceeded to dump the retired silver on the world market with the effect of depressing the price of silver to 25 cents an ounce, a plan that practically destroyed the purchasing power of our oriental customers with all the disastrous world-wide effect this reduction in purchasing power entailed.

In witnessing the effect of this monetary manipulation, I wonder what your economists have ever done or said about it? Did it or did it not upset the world's financial economy?

If your recommendation to "Congress to repeal the Silver Purchase Act" and "end this disgraceful business" was accepted and all the silver money was retired and the silver stocks of the Government were dumped on the market, tell us, as an economist in light of your observation and experience, when the British "meddled with the delicate monetary

systems" to upset the national economy of India by withdrawing their silver rupees from circulation and dumping the silver on the market, what would be the effect of the plan you and the members of your committee now advocate on our national economy and the stabilization of our Government credit at a time when we, like China, "are at the most dangerous period in our history"?

In concluding this statement in support of our Government's silver-purchase program, I direct your attention to three incontrovertible facts:

1. The Government is making a substantial profit on the purchase and use of silver as money.

2. The American people are effecting a real saving in using silver money placed in circulation by the Treasury in paying the operating expenses of the Government instead of using a like amount of Federal Reserve notes borrowed into circulation.

3. The Government tax income is materially increased by the operation of the silver-mining industry, and industry as a whole is benefited by the production of related useful metals indirectly financed by mining silver.

I defy you or any member of your committee to successfully dispute these facts.

Surely, if there ever was a time when our Government and the Congress needed the steadying hand and advice of informed money experts, it is now when the members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy should have a singleness of purpose and be influenced by "no personal, private interest in any of these issues" and unite in directing their efforts so that "their accumulated knowledge can be put to some good use."

If the members of the Economists' National Committee for Monetary Policy are sincere in their desire to safeguard our country's financial structure and protect the welfare of the American people, let them come to the assistance of the Government and the Congress in devising and putting into operation a stable monetary system with a dollar of unchanging value fair to the debtor and the creditor alike, let these eminent educators unite in leading the American people in a movement to give this country a system of sound money based on redemption by the use of the precious metals, gold and silver, sufficient in quantity to supply the money function in transacting both domestic and international business.

To the end that we may continue to be a better and more prosperous Nation secure in our liberties and the ideals of our Government, I stand ready, anxious, and willing to render you and the members of your committee a full measure of support.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Has it not now developed that this silver which has been purchased by the Government is going to be a very vital element in the war industry? You were present at a hearing when you heard the request made by Mr. Nelson for permission to use this silver, some 100,000 tons, now in the Treasury.

Mr. WHITE. That is correct. Some silver can be used as a substitute for the baser metals. Of the 100,000 tons in the Treasury, 47,000 is what they call free silver. As a matter of fact, all of the other silver is pledged in the same way that gold has been pledged throughout the world, for the redemption of silver currency in the form of silver certificates. It is now proposed to remove that silver, the backing for the \$2,000,000 of

silver certificates, which would make our silver certificates purely fiat money, just as they did in Canada. The coverage there has all been removed and their currency is fiat money.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Will not that silver be in the nature of a loan to be returned after the emergency is over?

Mr. WHITE. I believe some plan of that kind has been suggested. Any way you take it, the Government is fortunate, indeed, to be able to acquire 1,300,000,000 ounces of silver at no cost to the taxpayers. Mr. Morgenthau himself testified in response to questions that I propounded, and he has previously stated repeatedly that there is no provision of law that prevents the Treasury from doing with the silver, the idle silver, the excess silver, what has been done with the other silver that has been put into circulation. I want to get it across to the people of the United States that this free silver, this 1,361,000,000 ounces of free silver reposing in the United States Treasury, has not cost Uncle Sam a single penny. Not only has it not cost the Government any money, but it has saved the American people—the certificates that have been issued against the silver now held for redemption has saved the people thousands of dollars in the form of interest, because the Government puts the money into circulation in paying its running expenses, and does not borrow this money. It goes through the tills and pockets of the people of this country without the interest feature attached to it, as would be necessary if it obtained and used Federal Reserve notes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The fact that it now develops that there is industrial use for silver strengthens the gentleman's argument; does it not?

Mr. WHITE. Yes; the silver obtained as seigniorage can be put to industrial use in defense work.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman feel that those to whom he has given answer now, these economists, would have our silver relegated to a subordinate position in our monetary system, perhaps used only for minor coins, if at all? If silver is no longer to be considered a "precious metal," how about gold? What else can serve as a basis for our money, other than bank credit?

Mr. WHITE. I will say to the gentleman that the leader of these economists, Mr. Kemmerer, economist at Princeton University, who put the South American countries on the gold standard, as well as China, makes a very definite proposition, invites the Congress and the Government to retire the silver certificates and dispose of the silver. I will say to the gentleman that in another brochure being put out now by this committee of economists ridiculing the monetary policy of the Government, that the speaker is preparing a very definite answer, taking the gentleman to South Africa so they can make a comparison between the mining conditions under which the blacks of South Africa work and live, in compounds and sleeping on cement blocks. I am making that comparison and I am bringing that forward to show

what those gentlemen would do to our beautiful centers of the mining industry in this country, in discarding our silver money and going to the South African gold fields for all our money metal as they propose to do.

Mr. CHENOWETH. One further question: What is behind the attitude of this group on the silver question? What is prompting it to take such action?

Mr. WHITE. They take a very odd attitude as educators, and it is certainly very unique and discouraging to find 65 of the best educated people, the highest authorities in our universities, bringing forward such specious—and I use that word "specious" in the full import of the term—such specious arguments against the most constructive and financially profitable fiscal operation that the Treasury of the United States or any other country ever engaged in.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DITTER (at the request of Mr. KINZER), for this week, on account of illness.

To Mr. KILBURN, for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. CLAYPOOL, for today, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6802. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2459. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity; and

S. J. Res. 144. A joint resolution designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 6, 1942:

H. R. 4845. An act to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$30 to \$40 per month, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

On June 8, 1942:

H. R. 6802. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 9, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 9, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 16, 1942.

Business to be considered: H. R. 7002, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard of nonfat dry milk solids.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 9, for consideration of war housing, room 1324, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, June 10, 1942, for consideration of H. R. 2119, H. R. 2914, H. R. 4222, H. R. 6350, and H. R. 6858.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7105, to provide for the suspension during the war of operating differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1720. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for the War Department, for military activities, amounting to \$39,417,827,337 (H. Doc. No. 769); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1721. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$7,447,075 (H. Doc. No. 770); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1722. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1943-44, amounting to \$250,000 (H. Doc. No. 771); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

tee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1723. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Public Roads Administration in the amount of \$5,000,000, and proposed authorization for the expenditure of \$93,160 of the funds appropriated by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 (H. Doc. No. 772); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1724. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs of the Office for Emergency Management, fiscal year 1943, of \$28,638,000 (H. Doc. No. 773); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1725. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Defense Transportation of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$7,216,515 (H. Doc. No. 774); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1726. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the emergency supplies for Territories and possessions in the amount of \$15,000,000, to remain available until 6 months after the termination of the unlimited national emergency declared by him on May 27, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 775); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1727. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the War Production Board of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$73,467,300 (H. Doc. No. 776); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1728. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation "Printing and Binding, Bureau of the Budget, 1942" (H. Doc. No. 777); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1729. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1730. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 501. Resolution granting a gratuity to Leonora Toland; without amendment (Rept. No. 2214). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 500. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before Subcommittee No. 3 of said committee on the bill (H. R. 7067) relative to injunctions against illegitimate labor practices and outlawing racketeering; without amendment

(Rept. No. 2215). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 67. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill entitled "Revenue revision of 1942"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2216). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 7201. A bill amending section 3460 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7202. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (50 Stat. 1009), to continue it in force during the existing war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCGEHEE:

H. R. 7203. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 7204 (by request). A bill to permit appointment of White House Police, in accordance with the civil-service laws, from sources outside the Metropolitan and United States Park Police forces; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. J. Res. 323. Joint resolution to create a commission for the emergency safeguarding of the Capitol and other buildings in the legislative group, and other buildings under the Architect of the Capitol; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6, relative to the rationing of sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7205. A bill for the relief of Thomas Patrick Heaney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MCGEHEE:

H. R. 7206. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lella E. Colvin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 7207. A bill for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 7208. A bill granting an increase of pension to Margaret C. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3032. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3033. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Lawrence County (Pa.) Pomona Grange, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 860, known as the Sheppard bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3034. Also, petition of the Mahoning Valley Garden Club of Lawrence County, Pa., opposing the destruction of Cook's Forest, Clarion County, Pa.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

3035. Also, petition of the Lawrence County (Pa.) Pomona Grange, urging the immediate suspension of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, and others, and the liquidation of their assets as fast as economically possible, thus saving millions of dollars to our hard-pressed United States Treasury as well as releasing thousands of employees for more important war work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3036. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Automotive Machinists, No. 1305, at San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3037. By Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Petition of Ida L. Dye, of Findlay, Ohio, and the signatures of 65 of my constituents of Hancock County, Ohio, urging passage of the late Senator Sheppard's bill, S. 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and so give the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917, viz, legal protection from the traffic in all alcoholic beverages and from commercialized prostitution in camp areas which threaten the health, morale, and efficiency of our defenders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3038. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Emmet H. Bozel, of Washington, D. C., and Leavenworth, Kans., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In joy and in sorrow, in victory or defeat, in all times and occasions, be Thou our confidence and strength as we pray, our Father, in the name of our Master. As Thou art one with all sufferers, the perplexed, and all in need, help us, O Lord, to walk in Thy ways. Waken in our breasts the unutterable silences and may we follow the Good Shepherd into the green pastures of love and by the streams of blessed quietness.

Enable us to meet every demand with a just purpose and with a simple directness, pledging ourselves, in all fidelity, to serve courageously and even to endure every challenge involved in our high calling. O Thou, who dost set keepers to guard the city of the soul, give Thine angels charge over our sons of freedom on other soils and their sleepless mothers.

Grant that the whispers of the divine voice may make the chambers of affection so holy that all gloom shall be softened and great peace attained under the tutelage of our Saviour. In Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 5, 1942:

H. R. 69. An act to authorize the adjustment of land-ownership lines within the General Grant grove section of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., in order to protect equities established by possession arising in conformity with a certain survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 483. An act for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others;

H. R. 1162. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the final homestead proof submitted by Henry Martin Coffman;

H. R. 1595. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of Lillian Last;

H. R. 1757. An act for the relief of James D. G. Alexander;

H. R. 2307. An act validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573);

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of George P. Crawford;

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Dorothy Silva;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Wiley W. Watkins;

H. R. 2934. An act for the relief of L. H. Martin;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.;

H. R. 3488. An act to provide that assistant or deputy heads of certain bureaus in the Department of the Interior shall be appointed under the civil-service laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3937. An act to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4213. An act for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-a-Chucky Dam site;

H. R. 4347. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the North Pacific Union Conference Association of Seventh-day Adventists;

H. R. 4476. An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment;

H. R. 4526. An act for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of Alfred Smith;

H. R. 4676. An act to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the de-

velopment of a proper entrance road to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4733. An act to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest, the Salmon National Forest, and the Targhee National Forest in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 5013. An act for the relief of James P. Crawford;

H. R. 5016. An act to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5142. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project;

H. R. 5210. An act for the relief of E. M. Conroy;

H. R. 5287. An act relating to the transfer to the Secretary of War of certain lands owned by the United States;

H. R. 5394. An act to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, etc.;

H. R. 5438. An act for the relief of the San Diego Gas & Electric Co.;

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska;

H. R. 5490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California;

H. R. 5527. An act for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne;

H. R. 5636. An act to expedite the settlement of claims and accounts incident to certain agricultural adjustment programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5680. An act for the relief of James M. Hays;

H. R. 5687. An act for the relief of Edwin L. Wade;

H. R. 5713. An act for the relief of George W. Lyle under the jurisdiction of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission;

H. R. 5723. An act for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss;

H. R. 5778. An act for the relief of Luther Tench and Mrs. Mildred Farmer Tench;

H. R. 5847. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell;

H. R. 5910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 6102. An act confirming the claim of Augustin Dominique Tureaud for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392;

H. R. 6365. An act for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover;

H. R. 6625. An act granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910;

H. R. 6646. An act to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6748. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder;

H. R. 7008. An act to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of \$5,000,000 in excess of existing authority;